DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 138 907 CG 011 482

AUTHOR Walker, Deborah K.
TITLE Runaway Youth: An Annotated Bibliography and Literature Overview. Office of Social Services and Human Development Technical Analysis Paper No. 1.
INSTITUTION Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation.
PUB DATE May 75
NOTE 122p.; For related document, see CG 011 455

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Annotated Bibliographies; *Crisis Therapy; Delinquent Rehabilitation; Emotional Maladjustment; Family Problems; Generation Gap; Literature Reviews; *Parent Child Relationship; Socially Deviant Behavior; *Youth; *Youth Problems
IDENTIFIERS *Runaways

ABSTRACT

This annotated bibliography and literature review aims at acquainting the reader with the knowledge base that presently exists in various literature sources on runaways. Although available knowledge from the literature is limited in reference to certain policy questions, the bibliography/overview does serve as an important beginning point for future inquiry about runaways. This effort is an attempt to determine the underlying causes, measures for prevention, methods of coping and rehabilitation. The 156 entries are grouped into sections, and include books, journals (English and Foreign language), government documents, dissertations, magazine and newspaper articles. (VG)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED138907

RUNAWAY YOUTH:

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY AND LITERATURE OVERVIEW

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Offic al Serv man D pment
Office of stant Se lanning Evalua
DEPARTME HEALT TION, WELF

CG 011 462

SS·HD Technical Analysis Paper No.1

RUNAWAY YOUTH:
An Annotated Bibliography
and Literature Overview

Deborah Klein Walker

May, 1975

Prepared for the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation
Department of Health, Education and Welfare

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
LITERATURE OVERVIEW	4
Summary	4
Introduction	6
Major Findings about Incidence and Incidents	7
Major Findings about Predisposing Factors	18
Definition of Running Away	22
Classification Systems for Runaways	24
Treatment Findings and Recommendations	30
Author Training or Affiliation	32
Composition of Samples	32
Methodology	33
Suggestions for Future Research and Evaluation	33
Footnotes	35
BOOKS	38
PROFESSIONAL JOURNALS (ENGLISH)	47
PROFESSIONAL JOURNALS (NON-ENGLISH)	85
GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS, MISCELLANEOUS REPORTS AND PAPERS	89
DISSERTATIONS	103
POPULAR MAGAZINES	107
NEWSPAPER ARTICLES	109

INTRODUCTION

The runaway youth phenomenon is not unique to the 1970's. American society has always had youth who run away from home for a variety of reasons. Some of the most well known popularized examples of such youth are Huckleberry Finn and Tom Sawyer in frontier Missouri, the wandering groups of transient boys of the depression years, and the hippies or "flower children" of the late 1960's.

Because of the marked increase in the number of runaway youth in the 1968 to 1972 period as well as the increased interest of many individuals in helping these youth, recent legislation authorizes the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to spend several million dollars for three consecutive years on local services to runaways. Before policies towards runaways at any level of operation--federal, state, local, individual--can be optimally formulated, it is desirable to have a full account of all that is known at this time about runaway youth.

In general, the major questions that need to be addressed are the following:

(1) Who are runaways? How is "runaway" best defined?

(2) What is the incidence (i.e., rate of occurence) of running away?

(3) What are the predisposing factors which lead to youths running away?

(4) What services are available for runaway youth and their families? Of these, which are effective?

(5) What are the various attitudes towards running away in American society? Within the context of the differing approaches to the phenomenon, what are the most desirable policies (in terms of services provided, legal regulations, etc.)?

One important source of information needed to answer these questions comes from the professional and popular literature on runaway youth. This annotated bibliography

and literature overview has been prepared to acquaint the reader with the knowledge-base on runaways that presently exists in the various literature sources. Even though available knowledge from the literature helps one only minimally to answer the policy questions listed, it does serve as an important basis or beginning point for future inquiry about runaways.

The majority of entries in this bibliography were located in a thorough search through many reference sources, including (1) Research in Education (ERIC), (2) Psychological Abstracts, (3) Child Development Abstracts, (4) Crime and Delinquency Abstracts, (5) Sociological Abstracts, (6) Dissertation Abstracts International, (7) Social Sciences Citation Index, (8) New York Times Index, and (9) Reader's Guide to Periodic Literature. An additional source of many entries was the bibliographies of the various articles and books located and the suggestions of individuals familiar with the runaway phenomenon. Most of the articles or books included in this annotated bibliography focus exclusively on runaway youth; a small minority of the entries include only a section specifically focusing on runaways. The self-reported delinquency studies which include a runaway item are summarized in the literature overview; only those studies which have been extensively analyzed with respect to the runaway responses are included in the annotated bibliography.

The 156 entries in this bibliography are grouped into sections as follows: (The number of entries for each section is in parenthesis.)

(1) Books -(12)

(2) Professional journals (English) - (77)

(3) Professional journals (Non-English) - (8)

(4) Government documents, miscellaneous reports and papers - (20)

(5) Dissertations - (5)

(6) Popular magazines - (18)

(7) Newspaper articles - (16)

All of the books, professional journal articles, dissertations, and government documents, miscellaneous reports and articles are thoroughly annotated for the reader. In each summary description of a book or article, the following information, if it is available, is included:

(1) author's professional background and/or professional affiliation when the article was written,

(2) author's definition of a runaway or running away,

(3) composition of sample discussed, including age, sex, ethnic identification, geographical local, etc.,

(4) classification system proposed for explaining runaway's behavior and/or characteristics,

(5) methodology used in the study,

(6) major findings relating to precipitating factors and/or causes of running away,

(7) major findings regarding the frequency and characteristics of runaway incidents, and

(8) findings or recommendations regarding prevention and/or treatment of runaways.

The literature overview is a brief summary of what the various annotated entries say about runaway youth. It is not an analytic discussion or interpretation of what the literature means or implies. Rather, the articles on runaway youth are summarized in this overview according to the eight categories listed above, under which each entry is annotated. In many cases, the overview also serves the function of a subject index.

It is hoped that this annotated bibliography and brief summary overview of the existing literature on runaway youth will be useful to a wide variety of people interested in runaway youth and their problems. This effort is one step towards understanding why runaway youths exist in our society and what steps can be taken to help them before, after, and during their running away.

LITERATURE OVERVIEW

Summary

Findings from the runaway literature at this time can not be easily integrated into a meaningful pattern or construct. It is especially hard to organize what is known in order to answer pertinent policy questions concerning runaway youth. Problems hindering the unification of past research findings into a coherent theory about runaway youth include: 1) lack of consistent definition, 2) lack of methodological sophistication, and 3) conflicting perspectives or theories about runaway behavior. At present, there is some good information about specific runaway subpopulations. But, since no one study has compared several subtypes of runaways from the same basic population (i.e., runaways from institutions, one-time runaways from home, multiple runaways from home, etc.), it is difficult to generalize from the findings of the narrowly focused studies in the literature to make statements about all runaways.

Highlights from the runaway literature reviewed for the bibliography are summarized below:

(1) Definition of Runaway:

There is a wide range of definitions of running away used in the literature. Some of the basic components included in these definitions of a runaway are 1) age, 2) parent's permission or consent, 3) psychological characteristics, 4) inclusion in missing persons records, 5) identification by a juvenile court, 6) child knowledge about consequences of his/her action, 7) time gone, 8) where ran from, 9) where ran to, and 10) previous runaway behavior. The most frequently used definition for running away from home requires the youth to be gone without his/her parents' permission or consent for a certain length of time.

(2) Incidence of Running Away:

The main source available for estimating the number of runaways is the police arrest and/or missing persons records. Since these official records have been shown to be low, biased estimates, other ways of estimating the incidence of

running away on both a local and national level (e.g., household sampling of youth and/or parents, school surveys, telephone surveys, etc., are now being tried. The "best guess" estimate frequently quoted in the literature is that there are about 500,000 to 1,000,000 youths who run away from home each year. Based on Census data, this would be approximately 1-1/2% to 3% of the total youth population, ages 10 - 17, in the United States.

(3) Predisposing Factors of Running Away:

A large majority of articles, especially the earlier ones, follow the traditional psychopathological model which attributes the basic reasons for running away to problems within the individual child (e.g., lack of ego strength, poor impulse control, depression, etc.). An increasing number of articles, especially during the past decade, follow the environmental context model which attributes the reasons for running away to various situational factors outside the individual. In addition, a small number of articles suggest that running away for many youths represents a positive and natural step in the normal growing-up process. The one outstanding fact about reasons for running away which holds up across most of the articles, regardless of their orientation towards runaways or their sample base, is that runaways most often have inadequate parent-child relationships and unhappy, stressful home environments.

(4) Services for Runaways:

Very few of the articles reviewed discuss approaches for dealing with runaway youth. A prominent theme of several articles is that running away should not be a police or juvenile court problem but rather a family problem which should be resolved within the family with the help of social service agencies. A large number of the articles which discuss treatment of adolescent runaways point out that most often the treatment of the youth must include the family or one parent. Finally, even though there are some recommendations for what services should exist for runaways and some descriptions of what presently does exist, no article reports the evaluation of a particular service or set of services for even a subpopulation of runaways.

Introduction

It is difficult to summarize the multidisciplinary literature on runaway youth into a sound theoretical framework from which meaningful social policy can be formulated. This difficulty is attributable mainly to the lack of a broad conceptual framework which is comprehensive enough to incorporate the disparate views on runaways cited in the literature. Without such a comprehensive framework -- which does not exist in any of the entries annotated -- it is impossible to integrate and/or compare meaningfully all the findings of the various studies.

The two main characteristics of the present literature which aggravate the above problem are the lack of a consistent definition(s) of runaways across studies, and the lack of methodological sophistication in many studies. Part of the reason for these problems is due to the nature of the runaway phenomena itself. "Running away" is a complex psychological and sociological problem which is difficult to define, explain, and, therefore, study. A third reason for the problem is the differences and diversity of the various disciplines' vocabularies, theories and biases. It is always hard to integrate many disciplines' orientations to a problem or phenomena into a framework that will be understandable and useful as a whole, as well as still accountable to all the individual disciplines.

Within the context of these constraints and problems, the available literature on runaway youth will be summarized here according to the following basic topics which are summarized for each article in its annotation:

--Major findings about incidence and incidents
--Major findings about predisposing factors
--Definition of running away
--Classification systems for runaways
--Treatment findings and recommendations
--Author training or affiliation
--Composition of samples
--Methodology

In addition, a short section at the end of the overview presents suggestions for future research and evaluation projects on runaway youth.

Major Findings About Incidence and Incidents

Since accurate information about the incidence of running away from home is difficult to collect, little is known conclusively about both the incidence (i.e., rate of occurrence) and/or incidents (episodes) of running away from home. Most of what is known about the frequency of running away is specified in terms of the number of reported incidents. In those cases where the size of the total youth population as well as the number of total runaway incidents is known, the number of runaway incidents can be converted into an estimate of the incidence of running away.[1] The most commonly used source for determining the number of incidents of running away is police records--either missing persons records (39, 40, 76, 87) or arrest records (6). The only official national estimate of the number of runaway incidents comes from the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Uniform Crime Reports, reporting there were 163,863 runaway arrests (based on 3,601 agencies' reports) in 1972 and 121,600 (based on 3,256 agencies' reports) in 1973. As might be expected, both types of police records are under estimates of the actual number of youths in flight since for various reasons, many cases are never reported as missing persons and many youths are never arrested for running away by the police.

Other estimates of the number of runaway episodes in the literature come from reports of specific runaway shelters (26, 30, 31, 99, 101) records of the Traveler's Aid Society (16, 38, 58), and records of the "transiency bureaus" of the 1930's (64, 65, 66, 72). None of these latter estimates--all of which give biased glimpses of the phenomenon at the local level--are adequate for determining an estimate of the number of incidents and/or incidence on a national level. One study (76) has compared the estimate of runaways obtained from one of these sources--missing persons records--to estimates from other sources, mainly reports of students in school in the same area. In this investigation by Shellow and his associates in the early-mid 1960's, the high school students in the particular area under concern reported six times as many instances of running away as were showing in the local missing persons records. In addition, a recent incidence feasibility study (99) conducted in Colorado found that official police estimates of incidence were generally lower than those obtained by interviewing samples of youths and their parents. This follows the general pattern established in numerous other

studies of juvenile delinquency: i.e., estimates of official delinquency are much different and lower than those based on self-reported behaviors.[2]

Estimates or best guesses of how many youth run away from home each year in the United States range from 500,000 to 1,000,000 youths, ages 10-17 (1, 13, 34, 110, 116, 130, 133, 146, 149). Of the runaways, it is speculated that a little more than one-half are girls and the average age is about 15 years old. Based on the 1970 census figures, if there are 500,000 one-time runaways per year, then approximately 1-1/2% of the total U.S. population, ages 10-17, run away from home each year.[3] Furthermore, using the 1972 Current Population Survey data as a base, this means that approximately 2.7% of all families with at least one youth, ages 10-17, will have at least one runaway per year.[4]

Because an accurate national estimate of the incidence of running away would be useful for policy-makers and legislators, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare funded in 1974 a pilot study (99) to determine the feasibility of estimating the incidence of running away by interviewing a sample of households in both a rural and large metropolitan area. Based on the parent reports of families with at least one youth, ages 10-17, 2.06% of the youth population (or 4.24% of households with youth, ages 10-17) had run away from home during the previous year. When this estimate was corrected for parents who did not acknowledge a runaway youth in the household, 3.63% of the youth population (or 7.13% of the youth households) had run away from home during the previous year.[5]

The studies of self-reported delinquency behaviors, which have included a question about running away from home, are summarized in Table 1 with regards to the sample base, the method used to inquire about running away, and the findings with respect to incidence of running away.[6] These estimates which are difficult to compare because of the differing sample bases (e.g., non-delinquent youth, incarcerated delinquents, one-time delinquent offenders on probation, etc.) and differing time referents applied to the runaway item (e.g., "within the last year," "ever," "within the prior three-year period," etc.), vary from 2% to 15% for non-delinquent youth samples and up to 80% for training school or incarcerated delinquent youth samples. For example, Bachman (Table 1) found that about 10% of a sample of tenth

grade boys reported having run away at least once within a three year period prior to 1966; while Gold and Reimer (92) found 6% of a random sample of youth, 11 to 13 years old, reported having run away within three years prior to 1972. In 1971-1972 Swanson and Mobley (Table 1) found that about 11% of an Indiana sample of 7th to 12th graders reported running away within one year prior to testing.

A few articles discuss the nature of the runaway episode itself; i.e., How far does the youth run?, How long does the youth stay away?, Where does the youth go?, With whom does the youth run? Does the youth plan for the run?, and Why does the youth return? Only a small number of studies (99, 107, 112) included these and other questions about the nature of the runaway episode. A few of the scattered findings across these and other studies, some of which have very different sample bases, are presented below.

At least one-half of all youth who run away from home stay within the town or general vicinity in which they live (98, 99, 101, 107, 112). Most runaway youth on the run go to a friend's or relative's house (98, 99, 107). In general the length of time gone from home increases with age (99). Every study which describes the frequency of the runaway episodes reports that the majority of runaways are on their first and often only run; the runaway repeater is definitely in the minority of the runaway population. Most runaway episodes seem to be poorly planned and reflect impulsive behavior responses (3, 12, 48, 76, 98, 99).

Data on whether or not a youth leaves with any one else and information on why a youth does or does not return home is practically non-existent. Reports on what parts of the year are most conducive to running away are contradictory and scant. In general, there seems to be a slight seasonal and monthly variation in running away, with more episodes tending to occur in summer and fall and near vacation times. In institutions the greatest number of runaway episodes occur within the first six months after admission (51, 55).

In summary, very little conclusive information is known about the nature of the runaway episode and the incidence of running away. The estimates of incidence vary widely, the highest being those of self-reported delinquency studies.

Table 1

Delinquency Studies which include Information about the Inci
of Running Away from Home

Study (Listed in Alphabetical Order)	Sample Base	Method Used to Inquire about Running Away	F
Akers (1964)	992 junior high school youth, ages 13-17 years, in an urban northeastern Ohio community in spring, 1961.	Anonymous questionnaire, using Nye-Short Scale (1957); no time reference for runaway item mentioned.	No sig ferenc number report four s classe In tot 106 (4 64 mal out of naires analys mately these, one or 18, mo
Bachman (1970)	2213 tenth grade boys from 87 public high schools in 1966.	Confidential questionnaire; runaway item specified the time period "within the last three years."	11% of respon had ru home (times; times; 7%-onc

Table 1

include Information about the Incidence
nning Away from Home

Method Used to Inquire about Running Away	Findings
Anonymous questionnaire, using Nye-Short Scale (1957); no time reference for runaway item mentioned.	No significant differences among the number of runaways reported for each of four socioeconomic classes were found. In total, there were 106 (42 females and 64 males) runaways out of 836 questionnaires used in the analysis (approximately 12.7%). Of these, 88 ran away one or two times and 18, more than twice.
Confidential questionnaire; runaway item specified the time period "within the last three years."	11% of the sample responded that they had run away from home (1%-five or more times; 1%-3 or 4 times; 2%-twice; and 7%-once).

Table 1 (Continued)

Delinquency Studies which include Information about of Running Away from Home

Study (Listed in Alphabetical Order)	Sample Base	Method Used to Inquire about Running Away
Brennan, Blanchard, Huizinga, and Elliott (1975) (See 99)	A probability sample of 640 households in northeastern Colorado and 2000 households in the Denver SMSA were screened for the existence of runaway youth, ages 10 - 17, in late 1974.	Interview. Both parent and youth were asked (1) if the youth had ever been gone from home without parental permission or consent in the last year, and (2) if the youth had ever run away from home during the last year; for both items, the frequency and duration of episodes was recorded.

Table 1 (Continued)

tudies which include Information about the Incidence of Running Away from Home

ample Base	Method Used to Inquire about Running Away	Findings
ility sample of eholds in tern Colorado households in er SMSA were for the exist- runaway youth, - 17, in late	Interview. Both parent and youth were asked (1) if the youth had ever been gone from home without parental permission or consent in the last year, and (2) if the youth had ever run away from home during the last year; for both items, the frequency and duration of episodes was recorded.	Based on the parent report sample, 2.06% of the youth population (or 4.24% of households with youth, ages 10-17) had run away from home during the previous year. When this estimate is corrected for parents who did not acknowledge a runaway youth in the household, 3.63% of youth population (or 7.13% of youth households) had run away within the previous year. In addition, 1.76% of all youth (or 3.76% of youth households) had run away in the previous year for episodes of 24 hours or longer.

Table 1 (Continued)

Delinquency Studies which include Information about of Running Away from Home

Study (Listed in Alphabetical Order)	Sample Base	Method Used to Inquire about Running Away
Brennan, Brewington and Walker (1974) (See 100)	A stratified quota sample of 880 Denver youth, ages 10-19, in 1973.	Interview; runaway item specified the time period "during the last year."
Clark (1965)	628 (200 females and 428 males) black and white youth in Ohio schools for delinquents in 1960-1961.	Questionnaire of item adapted from the Nye-Short (1957) scale; no time reference mentioned.

Table 1 (Continued)

Studies which include Information about the Incidence of Running Away from Home

mple Base	Method Used to Inquire about Running Away	Findings
fied quota sample enver youth, ages n 1973.	Interview; runaway item specified the time period "during the last year."	132 (approximately 15%) said they had run away from home.
females and 428 lack and white Ohio schools nquents in l.	Questionnaire of items adapted from the Nye-Short (1957) scale; no time reference mentioned.	The number of times the youth admitted running away from home (in a weighted average) was 1.3 for females and 1.6 for males. The median age of onset for running away was 14.3 years for females and 14.1 for males.

Table 1 (Continued)

Delinquent Studies which include Information about the Incidence of Running Away from Home

Study (Listed in Alphabetical Order)	Sample Base	Method Used Inquire about Running Away	Findings
Epps (1967)	346 juniors (159 white, 111 black, and 76 oriental) in a Seattle high school in spring, 1958.	Anonymous questionnaire based on the Nye-Short (1957) scale; the runaway item was only given to males; runaway item specified "ever in the youth's lifetime."	The following are percentages of runaway boys in each of four socioeconomic levels, among which there were no significant differences: Group 1 (low SES) - 12.1% (n=91); Group 2 - 7.5% (n=80); Group 3 - 14.8% (n-54); Group 4 - 8.9% (n=45).
Elliott and Voss (1974)	2617 youth who entered ninth grade in 1963 in San Diego and were followed for four years through high school.	Confidential questionnaire after the Nye-Short (1957) scale given to sample in ninth and twelfth grades; the runaway item specified the time frame to be within the three previous years.	In junior high school 313 males (mean=.234) and 267 females (mean .210) reported running away from home (overall mean=.222). In senior high school 33 males (mean=.279) and 270 females (mean-.22 reported running away from home (overall mean=.253).

Table 1 (Continued)

dies which include Information about the Incidence of Running Away from Home

le Base	Method Used Inquire about Running Away	Findings
rs (159 white, and 76 ori- a Seattle ol in spring,	Anonymous questionnaire based on the Nye-Short (1957) scale; the runaway item was only given to males; runaway item specified "ever in the youth's lifetime."	The following are percentages of runaway boys in each of four socioeconomic levels, among which there were no significant differences: Group 1 (low SES) - 12.1% (n=91); Group 2 - 7.5% (n=80); Group 3 - 14.8% (n-54); Group 4 - 8.9% (n=45).
who nth 963 in and wed for through l.	Confidential questionnaire after the Nye-Short (1957) scale given to sample in ninth and twelfth grades; the runaway item specified the time frame to be within the three previous years.	In junior high school 313 males (mean=.234) and 267 females (mean=.210) reported running away from home (overall mean=.222). In senior high school 332 males (mean=.279) and 270 females (mean-.228) reported running away from home (overall mean=.253).

Table 1 (Continued)

Delinquency Studies which include Information about the Incidence of Running Away from Home

Study (Listed in Alphabetical Order)	Sample Base	Method Used to Inquire about Running Away	Findings
Erickson and Empey (1963)	Four randomly selected samples of males, ages 15 to 17 years (N=180): (1) 50 high school males never seen in a court. (2) 30 high school males in court once. (3) 50 repeat offenders on probation in a community treatment program. (4) 50 incarcerated offenders.	Interview; runaway item referred to "ever in a youth's lifetime."	The percentage of sample who admitte running away follo (1) non-delinquent 22%; (2) one-time fenders - 24%; (3) linquents in commu treatment - 46%; (incarcerated delin quents - 60% (tota sample - 38%).
Eynon and Reckless (1961)	363 white, juvenile delinquent, first admissions to a Ohio training school in 1958.	Questionnaire (and interview with those who had reading difficulties) based on Nye-Short (1957) scale; time reference for runaway item not specifically mentioned but was probably "ever."	182 males (50.1%) mitted running awa from home; of thes 56% had companions and the median ons age was 13.0 years

Table 1 (Continued)

Studies which include Information about the Incidence of Running Away from Home

Sample Base	Method Used to Inquire about Running Away	Findings
domly selected of males, ages years (N=180): igh school s never seen court. igh school s in court once. epeat offenders robation in a unity treatment ram. ncarcerated nders.	Interview; runaway item referred to "ever in a youth's lifetime."	The percentage of each sample who admitted to running away follows: (1) non-delinquents - 22%; (2) one-time offenders - 24%; (3) delinquents in community treatment - 46%; (4) incarcerated delinquents - 60% (total sample - 38%).
e, juvenile nt, first ns to a Ohio school in	Questionnaire (and interview with those who had reading difficulties) based on Nye-Short (1957) scale; time reference for runaway item not specifically mentioned but was probably "ever."	182 males (50.1%) admitted running away from home; of these, 56% had companions and the median onset age was 13.0 years.

Table 1 (Continued)

Delinquency Studies which include Information about the Incidence of Running Away from Home

Study (Listed in Alphabetical Order)	Sample Base	Method Used to Inquire about Running Away	Findings
Gold and Reimer (1974) (See 107)	1395 youths, age 11 to 18 years, in the 1972 National Survey of Youth.	Interview; runaway item specifically referred to the "previous three year period."	6% of the sample said they had run away from home.
Mobley and Swanson (1973)	Probability sample of 931 youths, grades seven to twelve, in six counties in Indiana in 1971-1972; and 233 adjudicated youth on parole and probation.	Anonymous questionnaire; runaway item specifically referred to "within the past year."	Among the students reporting (n=732), 78 or approximately 10.6% (41 males and 37 females) said they had run away (48 - once; 21 - 3 times; 9 - 6 or more times.) Among adjudicated delinquents reportin (n=183), 93 or approximately 45.4% said they had run away (24 - once 35 - 3 times, 24 - 6 or more times).

Table 1 (Continued)

Studies which include Information about the Incidence of Running Away from Home

e Base	Method Used to Inquire about Running Away	Findings
s, age 11 s, in the nal Survey	Interview; runaway item specifically referred to the "previous three year period."	6% of the sample said they had run away from home.
y sample ths, en to six coun- diana in and 233 d youth and proba-	Anonymous questionnaire; runaway item specifically referred to "within the past year."	Among the students reporting (n=732), 78 or approximately 10.6% (41 males and 37 females) said they had run away (48 - once; 21 - 3 times; 9 - 6 or more times.) Among adjudicated delinquents reporting (n=183), 83 or approximately 45.4% said they had run away (24 - once, 35 - 3 times, 24 - 6 or more times).

Table 1 (Continued)

Delinquency Studies which include Information about the Incidence of Running Away from Home

Study (Listed in Alphabetical Order)	Sample Base	Method Used to Inquire about Running Away	Findings
Nye and Short (1957)	Three samples in 1955: 2350 public high school youth in the far west; 320 youth from a western state's training school; 596 public high school youth in rural and suburban sections of a midwestern state.	Anonymous questionnaire; no time reference for the runaway item was mentioned.	Based on two samples' numbers of boys (ages 16 to 17) whose response fit one of 18 delinquency scale types, 23 out of 570 males (about 4%) in public schools and 77 out of 125 males (about 62%) in a training school reported having run away from home.
Porterfield (1943)	2049 alleged delinquents who were the case load of the juvenile court in Fort Worth in 1931, 1933, and 1935; and 337 college students in 1940 - 1941.	Anonymous questionnaire; time reference for the runaway item not specifically mentioned but was probably "ever in a lifetime."	14.5% of males and 4.3% of females in college said they had run away from home before entering college; of these, none were ever charged with the offense; 42.0% of the males and 31.5% of the females in the alleged delinquent group had been charged with the runaway offense.

Table 1 (Continued)

cy Studies which include Information about the Incidence of Running Away from Home

mple Base	Method Used to Inquire about Running Away	Findings
ples in 1955: ic high school the far west; from a western raining school; c high school rural and sections of a n state.	Anonymous questionnaire; no time reference for the runaway item was mentioned.	Based on two samples' numbers of boys (ages 16 to 17) whose response fit one of 18 delinquency scale types, 23 out of 570 males (about 4%) in public schools and 77 out of 125 males (about 62%) in a training school reported having run away from home.
ged delin- o were the of the juve- t in Fort 1931, 1933, and 337 tudents in 41.	Anonymous questionnaire; time reference for the runaway item not specifically mentioned but was probably "ever in a lifetime."	14.5% of males and 4.3% of females in college said they had run away from home before entering college; of these, none were ever charged with the offense; 42.0% of the males and 31.5% of the females in the alleged delinquent group had been charged with the runaway offense.

Table 1 (Continued)

Delinquency Studies which include Information about the Incidence of Running Away

Study (Listed in Alphabetical Order)	Sample Base	Method Used to Inquire about Running Away	Findings
Short and Nye (1958)	Based on the samples reported in Nye and Short (1957): (1) 75% sample from the three western high schools. (2) 100% sample of three mid-western communities. (3) 100% sample of training schools.	Anonymous questionnaire; time reference for the runaway item not specifically mentioned but was probably "ever in a lifetime."	The following percentages of the samples admitted running away from home: (1) western (13.0% males, 11.3% females) (2) mid-western (12.9% males, 9.8% females); and (3) training schools (68.1% males, 85.5% females). The following percentages admitted running away from home more than once or twice; western (2.4% males, 1.0% females); (2) mid-western (2.8% males, 1.0% females) and (3) training schools (37% males, 51.8% females)

Table 1 (Continued)

Studies which include Information about the Incidence of Running Away

mple Base	Method Used to Inquire about Running Away	Findings
n the samples d in Nye and (1957): sample from three western h schools. % sample of ee mid-western mmunities. % sample of ining schools.	Anonymous questionnaire; time reference for the runaway item not specifically mentioned but was probably "ever in a lifetime."	The following percentages of the samples admitted running away from home: (1) western (13.0% males, 11.3% females) (2) mid-western (12.9% males, 9.8% females); and (3) training schools (68.1% males, 85.5% females). The following percentages admitted running away from home more than once or twice; (1) western (2.4% males, 1.0% females); (2) mid-western (2.8% males, 1.0% females) and (3) training schools (37.7% males, 51.8% females).

Major Findings About Precipitating Factors

The runaway articles which investigate and describe reasons why youth run away from home can be placed along a continuum, the extremes of which represent two main orientations towards the reasons for human behavior: 1) that which follows the traditional psychopathological model, and 2) that which follows the environmental context model. The former attributes the basic reasons for running away to problems within the individual child. The latter attributes the reasons for running away to various situational factors outside the individual child. Often the orientation of an article is closely related to the author's view of the world adopted during his/her professional training.

By far the large majority of studies, especially the earlier ones (1930's to 1950's), utilize the individual psychopathological model. For example, Armstrong (2, 14) describes running away as a "psychoneurotic reaction" attributable to youth with mental deficiency, subnormal intelligence, poor impulse control and unstable make-up. Several psychiatrists view running away as an acting out of unresolved Oedipal conflict pressures (69, 74, 80, 81, 115). Robey (11) states that running away in adolescent girls is invariably "indicative of extensive and severe individual and family pathology" which occurs often when the adolescent girl runs "to ward off the unconscious threat of an incestuous relationship with her father, the fear of resultant dissolution of the family, and the concurrent depression" (p. 127). Furthermore, Riemer (68) suggests that running away represents "a severe narcissistic disorder" of an "extremely negative character," and describes such youth as antagonistic, surly, defiant, assaultive, disruptive, and impulsive. Leventhal (53, 54) also suggests that runaways show severe pathology, especially in their over-concern with loss of control (both internal and external) and with ego surrender.

Others who support the individual psychopathological view have attributed runing away to impulsive, acting-out behaviors (11, 88), disturbing parent-child relationships which lead to a fear of rejection of the parental figure by the runaway youth (28, 114), premature attempts to achieve independence and autonomy (75, 82, 115), depression, anxiety and strong inner tensions (48), and a need to express hostility and revenge (79). Articles by

Jenkins and others (44, 45, 46, 47, 77, 86) employ the following American Psychiatric Association definition of the behavior disorder of children entitled "runaway reaction":

> Individuals with this disorder characteristically escape from threatening situations by running away from home for a day or more without permission. Typically they are immature and timid, and feel rejected at home, inadequate, and friendless. They often steal furtively. (45, p.169)

In a follow-up study of runaways from a clinic population it was found that runaways had higher incidences of psychiatric illness (especially sociopathic personality), more arrests, more incarceration and more divorce (70, 71).

Contrasted with the psychiatric or psychological orientation is that which views the runaway phenomenon as primarily a function of environmental pressures. For example, writers during the American depression years of the 1930's state that running away is largely a result of poor economic and social conditions at home (8, 65, 66, 72, 78). Beggs (3) describes running away, not only as an escape from stress, but also as an S.O.S. signal and an attempt on the part of the runaway to change the situation and have his/her feelings honored as well as achieve a measure of self-determination. Lubeck and Empey (59) view running away from institutions as an expected outcome in an unresponsive social system. Hildebrand (34) described a runaway youth as "a second generation delinquent" who is "often the seed of the future felon," and attributes the main cause of such behavior to poor home environment and lack of family discipline. In the same vein, Lowrey (58) attributes running away to school and family problems, and to a youth's feeling of being unwanted or rejected at home. Several authors (7, 35, 120) point out that the runaway youth is often the family scapegoat or victim of a family stressful situation.

Several authors suggest that for many youths running away represents a positive and natural step in the normal process of growing-up. For example, running away has been called an interlude to "going straight" (50), "an initiation into adulthood" (1), and an expression of a "developing sense of selfhood and independence" (67).

Goldmeier and Dean (30), p.237) view running away as a "positive aspect of coping in which support is sought from peers rather than from the adult-dominated environment of the family of school." Balser (16) describes such behavior as a positive step in problem-solving. Wein (12) states than runaway youth have made an independent decision to run away, often after much misery over home and/or school, out of a basic commitment to him/herself and his/her needs and desires. Wattenberg (87) reports that the largest number of boys in this study ran to search for adventure. Shellow et al. (76) found that the majority of runaways identified were "healthy" normal adolescents who used running away as one way to deal with their problems, and that only a very small minority had multiple problems which suggested some psychopathology.

It is important in a discussion of predisposing factors to note that numerous articles point out that runaways often have more inadequate parent-child relationships and more unhappy or problem home environments than non-runaways. This general recognition of family or parent problems for a large number of runaways is true across multiple sample bases, varying definitions of runaways, and differing orientations towards the reasons for running away. Suddick (83) in his literature review points out the same "inescapable conclusion."

For example, several studies report that a large proportion of runaways (especially when compared to non-runaways and the general adolescent population) come from broken homes (16, 30, 51, 56, 65, 66, 76, 98, 112, 120). Other articles emphasize that runaways result from poor home environments (12, 14, 39, 40) and/or have troubling parent-child or sibling relationships (4, 6, 18, 27, 28, 35, 42, 58, 82, 98, 99, 114). Several articles mention instances of physical abuse in the home (6, 14, 35, 99). Finally, D'Angelo (6) refers to running away as another "symptom of escalating incidence of family breakdown" in America at this time. He sums up the relationship of the runaway with his/her family by stating that "the runaway group presents the image of multi-problem families with unstable relations between family members (particularly the parents) aggravated by poor interpersonal communication, great insecurity about the future, and living for the satisfaction of present needs" (p. 22).

The most frequently mentioned secondary reason why youth run away is problems at school (1, 5, 6, 12, 14, 30, 39, 40, 76, 98, 99, 112). The development and role of school difficulties in a youth's experiences happen in one of two ways: 1) in some cases, the source of a youth's conflict at home, which ultimately leads him/her to run away, is the youth's grades or performance in school (5, 98), while 2) in other cases, the family problems and conflicts at home develop first and subsequently affect the youth's performance in school (5). Exactly where the problems of runaway youth originate is often difficult to detect; in most cases the youth has significant problems at both home and school (2, 5, 6, 30, 76, 99). A common finding across several studies is that runaways, compared to non-runaways, have lower academic averages (2, 6, 30, 40, 76, 98) and higher rates of absenteeism and/or truancy (28, 30, 51, 76, 98). Furthermore, D'Angelo (6) and Shellow et al. (76) point out that runaways participate less in school activities and extra-curricular activities than do non-runaways. Shellow et al. (76) also report in their study that the school drop-out rate for runaways and non-runaways was about the same, and that runaways had a greater number of transfers during junior high school than did non-runaways.

In summary, the combined results of these past studies are not all conclusive with respect to the reasons why youths run away from home and/or institutions or with respect to the individual and situational characteristics of runaway youths and their families. In fact, the many perspectives expressed in the literature raise more questions than they answer. Because of this lack of closure for explanations of why youth run away, it seems most appropriate for policy-makers, administrators, and researchers at this point to adopt a "middle-of-the road" position--one that recognizes both ends of the hypothesized continuum. Such positions have been expressed in the literature by Goldmeier and Dean, and by Kaufman and his colleagues;

> There are a complex of factors involved and...an overly narrow focus on either the person or the situation is insufficient as a basis for understanding and helping runaways. (30, p. 237)

> The youngster who runs away...can best be understood in terms of the interaction of significant intrapsychic maturational variables, current sociocultural factors, and the all-important relationship of the child to his parents. (50, p.720)

These positions, which recognize the importance of both internal and external factors in explaining reasons for a runaway's behavior, have been recognized by an increasing number of authors during the past decade.

Definition of Running Away

There is a wide range of definitions of running away used in the articles and books annotated. Of those articles that even define the term "runaway," very few use exactly the same definition. Many definitions used are overlapping in scope. Some components of several definitions, such as an age or time limitation, may be the same while other qualifications in the definition are very different. In most of the articles reviewed the definition of running away is used only to describe the group being studied. In other articles, however, the definition used is more global, i.e., it attempts to describe the behaviors and actions of all runaways and not just the particular group being studied. Some articles use the definition in both of these manners, while many articles do not include a definition at all.

Some of the key factors included in definitions of a runaway are 1) age, 2) parent's permission or consent, 3) psychological characteristics, 4) inclusion of missing person records, 5) identification by a juvenile court, 6) child knowledge about consequences of his/her action, 7) time gone, 8) where ran from, 9) where ran to, and 10) previous runaway behavior. The largest group of articles is about runaways from home. The most frequently used definition is "a minor away from home without his/her parent's permission or consent" (1, 5, 30, 41, 53, 54, 99). Some definitions include a time period such as "away overnight" (11, 69, 71, 113), "away more than 24 hours" (68, 99, 112) or "away for eight hours or more" (99). One definition includes the condition that the child leaves voluntarily with the knowledge that he/she will be missed (76), while another includes the youth's stated intent to run away (11, 99).

A small group of articles define a runaway as either one who is an entry in the missing person records (39, 40, 85, 87, 98) or one who is identified as a runaway by the juvenile court (2, 9, 14, 35, 41, 48, 122). A few articles such as those summarized in Table 1, use the "runaway item" from a self-reported delinquency scale as the criteria for specifying runaway youths (99, 100, 107). The item about running away is usually very vague (e.g., How many times have you run away from home?) and, in all cases, does not define the behavior. Sometimes, a time period such as "within the previous year" or "during the past three years" is added.

Some articles define runaways as those who possess certain psychological characteristics. For example, several articles by Jenkins and his colleagues define a runaway as one who is classified as a "behavior disorder--runaway reaction," according to the American Psychiatric Association's categorization schema (44, 45, 46, 47, 77, 86). Another small group of articles equates running away to "crisis flight" (38) or to "fugues with impulse to wander" (80, 81). Finally, a subset of articles refers to runaway youth as if they were practically synonymous with more general groupings of youth and adults in society, such as "street people" (4, 61, 121), hippies (25, 50) and transient youth (8, 62, 63, 65, 66, 68, 102, 103, 104, 105).

A minority (about 20) of the entries annotated are about runaways from institutional settings, such as residential treatment centers or training schools (10, 15, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 32, 36, 37, 51, 52, 55, 57, 59, 60, 118). Within these definitions of "a runaway from an institution," there is almost as much variability as among definitions for a runaway from home. For example, the criteria for being included in a study on institutional runaways ranges from an "unauthorized absence for greater than 24 hours" (59) to "ran away at least twice" (32) to "left or attempted to leave without permission..." (24, 55) to "any occasion of being absent from school without permission, irrespective of duration of absence (21, 22, 23, 60).

In summary, very few articles use the same definition of a runaway. Because of the use of many different overlapping definitions of running away, the results of

the various studies on runaways' behavior can not be directly compared nor can the firdings be easily combined into a meaningful whole.

Classification Systems for Runaways

Many articles in the literature discuss runaways and their behavior or motives according to a variety of conditions and descriptive variables. Some of the most frequent comparisons among runaways and between runaways and non-runaways are made according to the following variables: sex, ethnicity, age, family background, number of times run away (once vs. repeater), reason why ran away, severity of problems, juvenile delinquency record, school grades and record, etc. One could view all comparisons of this type as suggestions for classifying runaways and their actions. Those articles which actually propose a formal classification system for explaining runaway types are listed in Table 2.

In their present form these classifications are basically heuristic devices for explaining differences in runaway behavior. The majority of these systems have been developed from observations and inferences about runaway behavior in therapy and counselling cases of the respective investigators. Most of these systems refer to the psychological reasons or motives underlying a youth's runaway behavior. Several schema have been developed from a classical psychoanalytic perspective (20, 57, 75, 82, 113, 114). One system includes the role of experience in classifying types of runaways (26), while another describes the differences in actual runaway behaviors (37). Most of the schema employ a very narrow and limited set of variables to delineate the runaway and his/her behavior.

In contrast to the vaguely defined and theoretically derived systems are the empirical typologies of runaway behavior types developed by Brennan and his associates (99, 100). These are the only classification systems which are derived from a large set of psychological, sociological and demographic variables, and are based on a sound set of rather sophisticated quantitative multivariate statistical methods developed for generating typologies from empirical sets of data. Even though these typologies overcome many problems

Table 2

Classification Systems for Runaways

Source	Categories	Sample Base
Bartollas (118)	1. Whites who run on impulse 2. Blacks who run on impulse 3. Whites who planned escape 4. Blacks who planned escape	Interview with 40 subjects (20 runaways and 20 non-runaways) in a state training school.
Berger and Schmidt (91)	1. Spontaneous 2. Reactive	36 males and females, 7-10 to 14-7 years old.
Brennan, Blanchard, Huizinga, and Elliott (99)	1. Spontaneous unplanned episodes 2. Deliberate successful episodes 3. Temporary "good time" episodes 4. Difficult long term escapist episodes 5. Temporary escapist episodes	Empirical typology based on cluster analyses techniques applied to the runaway episodes' data of 165 runaways--26 from a probability household sample and 139 from a purposive sample.
Brennan, Blanchard, Huizinga, and Elliott (99)	A. Lower delinquency runaways 1. Young runaways from stressful families 2. Middle class "loners": A "running to" model	Social-psychological or etiological typology based on multivariate methods applied to 37 different explanatory variables in four domains (family, school,

Table 2 (Continued)

Source	Categories	Sample Base
	3. Autonomous "older" runaways B. Delinquent runaways 4. Lower social class, high family and school stresses: high delinquency peers 5. Delinquent girls with highly stressful home and school situations and strong peer pressure toward delinquency 6. High social class, delinquent youth: stressful rejecting family, low school involvement, and high commitment to delinquent peers 7. Young males with highly stressful home and school situations and high commitment to delinquent peers	peers, personal) for 165 runaways --26 from a probability household sample and 139 from a purposive sample of known runaways.
Brennan, Brewington, and Walker (100)	1. Minority males (A): violent delinquents, multiple runaways	Empirical typology derived using multivariate analyses on data from a

Table 2 (Continued)

Source	Categories	Sample Base
	2. Middle class females: not alienated, good self-concept, occasional runaway 3. Minority males (B): extreme negative labeling and denial of access, highly delinquent, multiple runaway 4. One-time runaways: similar in many ways to non-delinquents, but of low self-concept and alienated 5. Lower status (females): high levels of alienation, negative labeling, denial of access, delinquency	Denver study of youth needs (n = 880 youth, ages 10-17, of which 132 were runaways).
Chamberlin (20)	1. Need to show independence 2. Need to be loved 3. Need to raise self-esteem 4. Need to express aggression toward authority	Case study of a 14-year old boy.

Table 2 (Continued)

Source	Categories	Sample Base
English (26)	1. Floater 2. Runaway 3. Splitter 4. Hard road freaks	300 runaway males and females at a runaway shelter.
Farrington et al. (27)	1. Crisis situation 2. Attention getting 3. Withdrawal 4. Impaired family relationships	28 males and females in a residential treatment center.
Greene and Esselystyn (35)	1. Rootless 2. Anxious 3. Terrified	Based on "beyond-control" cases in the California juvenile justice system.
Haupt and Offord (37)	1. Real 2. Gesture	92 males and females from a residential treatment center.
Homer (41)	1. Run to 2. Run from	20 females in a court clinic.
Institute for Scientific Analysis (109)	1. Sick 2. Bad 3. Free	Based on review of literature about runaway youth.
Levy (57)	1. Angry defiance 2. Psychotic disorganization 3. Escape 4. To go to one's own 5. Fusion with parents	16 females in residential treatment.

Table 2 (Continued)

Source	Categories	Sample Base
Rosenwald and Mayer (75)	1. Hypermature 2. Hypomature 3. Impulse ridden 4. Unclassified	Suburban delinquents, females.
Stierlin (113)	1. Uncontrollable ne'er do well 2. Crisis runaway 3. Sweet bad girl 4. Lonely runaway schizophrenic	21 males and females labelled "under-achievers".
Stierlin (82, 114)	1. Abortive 2. Lonely schizoid 3. Crisis 4. Casual	Small sample of males and females seen in therapy.

associated with the other systems reviewed, the meaning and possible uses of the individual types need to be clarified and refined, and the typologies must be further validated and developed.

Although several of the classificatory schema may identify key factors that may differentiate between large groups of runaways, none of them at present reflects a conceptual framework broad enough to consider or describe a wide range of runaways. All of these schema can be criticized for incomplete development, vaguely defined categories, and inadequate validation. Because of the differing samples on which the classificatory systems were developed and the differing definitions of runaways used in the studies, it is difficult to compare the classificatory systems in their present stages.

Treatment Findings and Recommendations

Surprisingly little of the runaway literature addresses the issue of which services and/or treatment works best for which runaways. In most of the articles which address these issues at all, it is only as a secondary focus of the article. The few themes regarding approaches for dealing with runaway youth that do emerge in the literature are the following:

(1) Running away should not be a police or juvenile court problem but rather a family problem which should be resolved within the family with the help of social service agencies (1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 112).

(2) Counselling and other services for families--especially those in crises--need to be available (1, 3, 6, 108, 114, 119). Beggs (3) suggests "around the clock" emergency support.

(3) Treatment of a runaway child should include the family and/or parents, if possible (1, 19, 39, 41, 44, 74, 89, 108, 114, 119). Stierlin (114) recommends differences in the type of family treatment, depending on the family mode and dynamics; he points out also that family therapy does not work for a casual runaway--i.e., one who runs

from a rejecting and neglecting parent. Robey (11) states that only the mother is needed in the treatment of adolescent girl runaways.

(4) With respect to individual therapy with some runaways, consistent, fair, and warm supportive treatment seems to work best (41, 73, 74, 79, 88, 108, 114). From her work with runaway girls, however, Homer (41) reports that insightful-oriented and family therapy works with girls who "run from" family problems, and not with girls who "run to" pleasures and freedom from constraints. Robey (11) points out that sometimes treatment should go on beyond the time that the youth or referring agency think "is necessary".

(5) In addition to the option of youth returning home after running away, adequate alternative services need to be available (3, 4, 5, 12, 109).

(6) There is some relationship--although complex and difficult to precisely describe--between institutional policies and runaway behavior (21, 22, 23, 36, 59, 118).

The types of services available at the various runaway houses across the country in 1973 are briefly described in the booklet by the National Youth Alternatives Project (110). More detailed descriptions of services at several runaway houses are also available (31, 99, 101, 106, 108). The two most discussed runaway houses are Huckleberry House in San Francisco (3, 12) and Runaway House in Washington, D. C. (31, 101, 108). In addition, Saltonstall (112) describes three community models (urban, suburban and rural) of services for runaway youth in Massachusetts. Finally, two entries (9, 34) describe how the juvenile justice system operates regarding runaway youth.

Even though there are some recommendations for what services should exist for runaways and some descriptions of what presently does exist, no article reports the evaluation of a particular service or set of services for even a subpopulation of runaways. In other words, there is a dearth of information available

about what works best--or even at all--for all runaways or a subgroup of runaways.

Author Training or Affiliation

Often knowing the author's or authors' professional background (such as social worker, psychiatrist, or juvenile court worker) gives a reader insights into an article's perspective of runaway youth. If the author's training is not given, sometimes the author's professional affiliation (such as a clinic, police department, or university) will help in identifying the article's viewpoint. The largest group (almost one half) of authors is psychiatrists. This is true of the earlier literature in the 1930's and 1940's as well as the later literature (since 1960). Although considerably smaller than the medical doctor group, the next two largest groups of authors include psychologists and social workers. Next, there are small groups of articles by social scientists (mostly sociologists) affiliated with universities and by affiliates with police departments. Finally, there is a small group of articles by lawyers, ministers, counselors at runaway houses, and journalists.

Composition of Samples

Most of the literature on the runaway phenomenon consists of small comparative studies of runaways and non-runaways from very select and restricted samples. A large number of the studies on youth runaways are based on subjects from clinic populations (7, 11, 53, 54, 68, 69, 70, 71, 74, 79, 80, 82, 89, 113, 114) or detention home/training institution populations (6, 10, 15, 21, 22, 23, 24, 33, 36, 44, 45, 46, 51, 55, 59, 60, 77, 86, 118). Occasionally an article will discuss a sample of runaways identified through missing persons records (39, 40, 76, 87, 98) or juvenile court records (2, 9, 14, 28, 35, 41, 48, 122), through records of residential treatment centers (20, 27, 37, 49, 57, 119), halfway houses or runaway centers and other alternative youth services (3, 4, 5, 26, 30, 31, 42, 99, 105, 108, 121), through reports of private service (16, 25, 29, 38, 58, 112) or public social service agencies (65, 66, 72, 98, 112, 120), by questioning children in schools (76; see Table 1), or by reports of youth from a sample of households (99, 100, 107; see Table 1).

Most of the studies focus on youth from approximately 12 to 18 years old. A few articles include younger children and a few focus only on the 16-year old and up. The majority of articles--especially those from the earlier literature--focus only on male populations. Most studies during the past ten years, especially the larger ones or those with a sample size over 80 (6, 28, 37, 39, 40, 76, 99, 100, 107, 112; see Table 1), include both males and females. From what is specified about the ethnic identification of the samples studied, it appears that most studies have included predominantly white youth; few have included minority youth.

Methodology

In addition to reporting basic descriptive statistics, the articles in the runaway literature use two basic methodologies for discovering and supporting facts about runaways and their actions. They are the case study method and the small comparison study in which significant tests are used to explore the difference between runaways and non-runaways on the same variable. The major danger with the first method is that the samples on which conclusive statements about runaways are made are extremely small. One major problem with many of the comparative studies cited is the selection of an inadequate and/or meaningless comparison group. A few studies, such as those of Lubeck and Empey (49) and those by Brennan and his associates (99, 100), employed relatively sophisticated statistical techniques, such as multi-regression stepdown analyses and stepwise discriminant analyses. In summary, the methodologies used to study runaways have been simple, somewhat unsophisticated and often inadequate by traditional social science research standards.

Suggestions for Future Research and Evaluation

In order to reduce the gaps and inconsistencies which now exist in the runaway youth literature, the following suggestions for future studies on runaway youth are made:

(1) Develop a definition (or classification system) for runaways, if possible, and encourage its use for all future program

descriptions and research or evaluation studies. At a minimum in the interim, include a definition of runaway in articles in the future.

(2) Encourage the use of valid social science methodologies (i.e., adequately defined control groups, advanced statistical techniques where appropriate, complete explanations of procedures, etc.) in future research and evaluation activities.

(3) Encourage interdisciplinary teams to study runaway youth in order to foster the maximum integration of the various disparate views on treating and understanding runaway youth.

(4) Encourage thoughtful research activities which investigate the predisposing factors and dynamics--especially those related to the parents and family--which result in youth running away from home. Because of inconclusive evidence for explaining why youth run away within one theoretical context, adopt a relatively open-minded position which recognizes the importance of both internal and external factors in explaining runaway behavior.

(5) Encourage systematic and thoughtful research and evaluation activities to examine what services or treatments work best for which types of runaways. Even though there are some recommendations for what should exist and some descriptions of what does exist, there is no evaluative information on what works best.

(6) At all times conduct research and evaluation in a manner which recognizes and respects the rights and needs of runaway youth.

Footnotes

[1] Divide the number of runaway incidents by the total youth population to get an estimate of the incidence of running away.

[2] For example, see the following studies:

Erickson, Maynard L. Group violations, socio-economic status, and official delinquency. Social Forces, 1973, 53, 41-52.

Erickson, Maynard L., and Empey, Lamar T. Court records, undetected delinquency and decision-making. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 1963, 54, 456-459.

Porterfield, Austin L. Delinquency and its outcome in courts and college. American Journal of Sociology, 1943, 49, 199-208.

Short, James F., and Nye, F. Ivan. Extent of unrecorded juvenile delinquency: Tentative conclusions. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 1958, 49, 296-302.

Williams, Jay R., and Gold, Martin. From delinquency behavior to official delinquency. Social Problems, 1972, 20, 209-229.

[3] This estimate is based on the 1970 census information which lists that there were 32,533,497 persons of ages 10 through 17 in the United States in 1970. Source: United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Characteristics of the Population (Vol. 1): U.S. Summary. (Part 1, Section 1), Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.

[4] These estimates are based on the 1972 Current Population Survey data: 71,034,064 - total household units: 53,071,160 - primary families; 54,457,665- total family units: 18,440,683 - families with at least one child, 10 to 17 years old.

[5] The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is now in the process of funding another study to access the incidence of running away on a national level.

[6] The following is the list of sources on self-reported delinquency which are listed in Table 1 and the text but are not in the annotated bibliography section, since only those studies which include extensive analysis of the runaway items are included in the annotated bibliography. The studies below, which include a runaway item, focus broadly on delinquency behaviors and not specifically on running away behavior.

Akers, Ronald L. Socioeconomic status and delinquent behaviors: A retest. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 1964, 1, 38-46.

Bachman, Jerald G. Youth in Transition. (3 vols.) Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1970.

Clark, Shirley M. Similarities in components of female and male juvenile delinquency. In W.C. Reckless and C.L. Neuman (Eds.), Interdisciplinary Problems in Criminology. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1965.

Epps, Edgar G. Socio-Economic status, race, level of aspiration and juvenile delinquency: A limited empirical test of Merton's concept of deviation. Phylon, 1967, 28, 16-27.

Elliott, Delbert S., and Voss, Harwin L. Delinquency and Dropout. Lexington, Mass.: Heath, 1974.

Erickson, Maynard L., and Empey, Lamar T. Court records, undetected delinquency and decision-making. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 1963, 54, 456-469.

Eynon, Thomas G., and Reckless, Walter J. Companionship at delinquent onset. British Journal of Criminology, 1961, 2, 162-170.

Mobley, Max J., and Swanson, Richard M. Indiana Youth Study Final Report. Carbondale, Illinois: Center for the Study of Crime Delinquency, and Corrections, Southern Illinois University, 1973.

Nye, F. Ivan, and Short, James F. Scaling delinquent behavior. American Sociological Review, 1957, 22, 326-331.

Porterfield, Austin L. Delinquency and its outcome in courts and college. American Journal of Sociology, 1943, 49, 199-208.

Short, James F., and Nye, F. Ivan. Extent of unrecorded juvenile delinquency: Tentative conclusions. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 1958, 49, 296-302.

BOOKS

1
Ambrosino, Lillian. Runaways. Boston: Beacon, 1971.

In this book intended for a general audience, the author, a journalist, describes the plight of a runaway youth for runaways themselves, their parents, and the advisors or counselors to both. Some of the major topics covered are the composition (numbers and nature) of the runaway population, reasons for running away, a description of problems facing youth on the run, methods of survival (including what to eat and where to sleep), legal and medical issues relating to runaways, and a listing of where to find help. A guide to Travelers Aid locations, halfway houses, and hotlines by state and city are included in the appendix. A runaway is defined as any youth under 17 or 18 years old (depending on the state) who leaves home without parental consent. Ambrosino reports that in 1969 there were about 500,000 runaways under 17 in the United States. Of this general population, about one half were girls, the average age was 15, most returned home within a week of running away, and one-half to one-third were arrested. The author states that running away can be a sign of good health, "an initiation into adulthood", a sign of trouble in the youth's family, and/or a cry for help. It is proposed that running away is not a police problem but, instead, a family problem which should be solved by the family through the help of varibus social agencies. (See also 13)

2
Armstrong, Clairette P. 660 Runaway Boys. Boston: Badger, 1932.

Armstrong, an employee of the Domestic Relations Court of New York City, writes about the 660 runaway boys seen at New York Children's Clinic from 1926 to 1930. The runaways in this book are delinquent children, ages 7 to 16 years; neglected children before the courts were eliminated. Most of the runaways were before the courts for some other charge besides running away; only 9% had no other charge. Of the total sample, 590 never left New York City and 79% had run from home more than once. The majority of reasons for leaving involved emotional conflicts with authorities, either at school or home, or some excessive burden of responsibility. "Wanderlust" was a motive in 2.4% of the cases, while a search of self-assertion or independence was never given as a reason. Escape from physical damage was the reason of some boys; 12% ran away after a severe beating

and 32% feared punishment. Armstrong concludes that the precipitating factors which led boys to become runaways and delinquents include broken homes, family pathology, cruelty, lack of supervision at home, poverty, and sub-normal intelligence. (See also 14)

3
Beggs, Larry. Huckleberry's for Runaways. New York; Ballantine, 1969.

The Reverend Beggs describes the founding and development of one of the oldest runaway houses now in operation in the United States. During the first year after Huckleberry's for Runaways opened in June, 1967, in the Haight-Ashbury section of San Francisco, it had 664 clients of which 448 were males, and 216 females, and the average age was 15.3 years. Most runaways left home over expressed discomfort and pain centered on the family; most had heard of the shelter on the street and over one-half eventually went home. Beggs concludes that running away is an S.O.S. signal or an "attempt to change the situation, not permanently desert it" (p.63). He states that few youth plan their flight which often appears to be an impulsive act or a "desperate attempt to have their feeling honored and to achieve a measure of self-determination" (p.79). In other words, a runaway is not just escaping stress but is taking the initiative to say something must be done.

Beggs, a founder and then director of Huckleberry's, includes the following items in his book: (1) descriptions of the runaway clients, (2) procedures for handling runaway youth by the San Francisco juvenile institutions, (3) the procedure at Huckleberry's when a runaway or a parent walks in, (4) interviews with runaways, (5) procedures for contracting and negotiating with families of the runaways, and (6) an interview with a family. Beggs points out that running away is a family problem instead of a police problem. Beggs' recommendations for the future include the establishment of around-the-clock emergency aid services for families and community resource centers for youth.

4
Blum, Jeffrey, D., and Smith, Judith, E. Nothing Left to Lose. Boston: Beacon, 1972.

After Blum and Smith graduated from college in June 1970, they joined the staff of Sanctuary, founded in the

summer of 1970 in Cambridge, Massachusetts, to help the thousands of transients in the Boston area. At that time Sanctuary operated a storefront counseling center, a hotline, and a hostel which gave free food and shelter to runaways and other transient youth. Based on their counseling and teaching experiences, the authors present case studies of 33 youth (12 females and 21 males) and their experiences. In the group of youth described, 26 were of ages 13 to 19, one third were black, the majority were from working class or lower middle class families, and one-half were from the metropolitan Boston area. The book discusses the challenges and myths of "street people", including runaway youth.

The authors point out that running away "seems to be an extreme rather than an atypical mode of response" (p.19), and that it is "often impossible to explain why one kid leaves home and another, with pressures that seem similar, remains" (p. 19). Sanctuary staff report that in most instances youth have run away from home because of a specific incident such as getting punished for smoking dope or for failing at school which is symptomatic of deeper and more pervasive family conflicts. Runaways can be grouped into two categories--those who do and do not have a home "in any human sense of the word to go back to" (p. 32). The authors strongly urge that runaways must not remain solely a legal problem but "what should be legally recognized are the reasons why kids sometimes can't live in their homes, situations which may cause kids much more harm than the act of running away" (p. 44). With respect to runaway services, the authors give the following guidelines for counseling runaways: (1) "The first priority is to make contact with the kid: to tell her who you are; to find out who she is; to find out why she came to you" (p. 19); (2) Use all available clues, including fantasies as a guide to understanding the youth; and (3) "It is crucial to take seriously the complaints and dilemmas which kids present rather than treating them as the result of a bundle of Freudian complexes" (p. 23). In those cases where reintegration with the family is desired, family counseling or therapy should be used in addition to the youth's counseling.

5
Bock, Richard, and English, Abigail. Got Me on the Run. Boston: Beacon, 1973.

Bock and English, June 1971 college graduates, write about runaway youth and their experiences in the Boston area.

The authors' descriptions and recommendations are based on their conversations with sixty runaways during the fall and winter of 1971-1972 at youth counseling centers in the Boston area and from their experiences as part-time counselors at the Sanctuary Hostel in Cambridge and the Place Runaway House in Boston. Because there were many runaway youth of working-class homes in Boston in the early 1970's Bock and English conclude that the publicized image of runaways as alienated middle class youth is misleading. The first section of the book contains case studies of twelve runaways' experiences at home, at school, on the street, in runaway houses and in juvenile institutions. In addition to the youth's own story, most of these narratives include the accounts of parents, teachers, counselors and legal officials who know the youth. The book's second section critically examines the social institutions which have the greatest impact on the lives of runaway youth--the family, schools, and the law. Suggestions and recommendations for effective policies towards runaway youth are made.

6
D'Angelo, Rocco. Families of Sand: A Report Concerning the Flight of Adolescents from Their Families. Columbus, Ohio: School of Social Work, Ohio State University, 1974.

D'Angelo and his colleagues at the School of Social Work at Ohio State University report a study in which they compared 82 runaways in institutional settings in Franklin County, Ohio, with a matched group (on sex, race, grade level, and residential demograph) of 82 volunteer non-runaways from six public high schools in the same area. The constituent traits of both groups or 164 individuals were as follows: 51.3% female, 48.7% male; 74.4% white, 25.6% black; 56% urban, 44% suburban; and mean age, 15.9 years for runaways, 15.4 years for non-runaways. Comparisons between the runaway group and non-runaway control group were made in the following areas: home life, religion, school, self-concept, relating to peers. Running away is described as "another symptom of escalating incidence of family breakdown" in the United States in the early 1970's. The author states that "the runaway group presents the image of multi-problem families with unstable relations between family members (particularly the parents) aggravated by poor interpersonal communication, great insecurity about the future, and living for the satisfaction of present needs" (p. 22).

When compared to the control group of non-runaways the institutionalized runaways were more often from broken homes, presented a more negative impression of their parents, reported more physical abuse, experienced more alienation and less trust with their parents, reported much lower academic averages in school, were involved in less activities at school, had difficulty forming close friendships, demonstrated a lower degree of self-acceptance on a standard attitude scale, had a lower self-concept to their physical condition (which was substantiated by more illness and hospitalization), argued with parents more about "friends", and avoided more structured or programmed activities. Extensive recommendations for dealing with the runaway problem are made according to three major themes: (1) help families in trouble by having crisis oriented services and reach-out programs for one-parent and step-parent families; (2) improve the school environment by providing more alternatives; (3) reform the juvenile justice system by introducing more flexibility. (Includes extensive bibliography on runaways, juvenile delinquency and other related topics.)

7
Kanner, Leo. Child Psychiatry. (3rd ed.). Springfield, Illinois: C.C. Thomas, 1957.

In the section on delinquency in this book, child psychiatrist Kanner discusses running away from home as an unusual, "atypical" phenomenon. He states that some reasons for running away are (1) an unpleasant home, (2) a fear of punishment, and (3) anger at parents for perceived unfairness (scapegoating). In addition, a "love of adventure" is often a factor. A fugue, wandering in a "condition of clouded consciousness", is a special form of running away which is found mainly in cases of schizophrenia, hysteria and epilepsy.

8
Minehan, T. Boy and Girl Tramps of America. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1934.

During the early 1930's sociologist Minehan posed as a bum and travelled with transient youth in train cars from "jungle camps" to mission shelters. Minehan's findings and impressions of transient youth from 509 case histories (493 males, 16 females) and 956 interviews

(884 males, 72 females) are presented in his book. The large majority of youth and adults on the road during the post-depression years left home because of hard times caused by economic problems. The majority were from the industrial eastern cities and stayed within a 500 mile radius of where they left home. There were very few rural or farm boys in the transient youth population. Minehan vividly describes how the transient youth got food and clothing and where they slept during these hard times. Begging was the most common occupation "on the bum". To survive on the road one needed to be quick, alert, gutsy and physically strong. Minehan presents an historical analysis of vagabondage which points out how most societies in social chaos have large groups of homeless wanderers. To service the large transient youth population of the 1930's, Minehan recommends the establishment of youth camps to train youth for a complex social life and its problems.

9
Murphy, Patrick T. Our Kindly Parent--the State: The Juvenile Justice System and How It Works. New York: Viking, 1974.

In this book, Murphy, chief attorney with the Juvenile Legal Aid Society in Illinois in the early 1970's, describes the operation of the juvenile justice system in Illinois and his struggle via legal channels to change many of its procedures. Even though one chapter is entitled "Runaways and the Courts," the treatment of runaways and other children considered "minors in need of supervision" is documented in illustrative case studies throughout the book. "Despite the excellent goals of the original reformers and the lofty language of juvenile court codes," Murphy states that "the simple fact is that after seven decades, juvenile courts are a failure," for they "have deprived children of procedural safeguards and have taken away their liberty" (p. 9).

Murphy describes the efforts of his office to litigate in both the state and federal courts concerning the following priority areas: (1) the incarceration of youth for running away from home, (2) the separation of children from parents on "neglect" charges when in fact the parents were merely poor and not simply neglectful, (3) the procedural defects in the system, such as the refusal of the court to inform parents and children of the consequences of certain

admissions, (4) the questionable "rehabilitative" procedures of juvenile institutions, such as isolation and drug treatments, and (5) the "dumping" of "neglected" children in state and out-of-state institutions. Murphy concludes that "with the exception of the small percentage of youngsters legitimately charged with serious felony offenses, most of the children and families dragged before the court today are there for reasons closely related to racial attitudes and poverty" and that "the court is expected to become some type of social instrument to resolve the problems that lack of money caused" (p. 172).

10
O'Connor, Z.C. The Runaway Boy in the Correctional School. New York: Teacher's College, Columbia University, 1938.

In 1929-1930 psychologist O'Connor conducted a study comparing runaways to non-runaways at the Children's Village in Dobbs Ferry, New York, a training school for 400 boys, ages 6-16. A group of 119 boys who had runaway from school were compared in 1929-1930 and six years later with a control group of 125 boys who had never run from the school during one year of residence. Even though the only statistical significant difference between the two groups was age (the runaways being older), the runaways tended to be less adjusted to the institution, most used to running away before correctional school, less socially flexible, and without many interests. Reasons given for running away included lack of fairness at the institution, desire to see family, unhappy at school, problems with authorities, pressure of group runaways, and merit system. The runaways adjustment after the institution tended to be inferior to that of the non-runaway.

11
Robey, Ames. The runaway girl. In O. Pollak and A. Friedman (Eds.), Family Dynamics and Female Sexual Delinquency. Palo Alto: Science and Behavior Books, 1969.

Based on his work with two Massachusetts court clinics, psychiatrist Robey discusses the characteristics of running away, one of the most frequent forms of acting-out in the adolescent girl. Running away is defined as "leaving home without permission for at least overnight, with the stated intent to run away" (p. 128). Robey emphasizes that running away for adolescent girls, "far from being a childish escapade, is almost invariably indicative of extensive and

severe individual and family pathology" (p. 127). After recognizing that running away can result from a wide variety of intolerable home situations, Robey points out that "in a large proportion of cases, there is considerable indication that the girl runs away from home to ward off the unconscious threat of an incestuous relationship with her father, the fear of resultant dissolution of the family, and the concurrent depression "(p. 127). Two case studies are presented as illustrations of the pattern of family interactions associated with adolescent girls' running away.

With respect to the treatment process, Robey recommends that the major emphasis should be placed "on the dynamics and on the observed fact that treatment is difficult and complicated, and must be continued far beyond the time that either the girl or the referring agency feels necessary" (p. 137). With treatment which involves both the mother and daughter, striking improvements can be made but "prognosis for a successful adult adjustment must remain guarded" (p. 137). Without treatment, the "long-term results are almost always undesirable" (p. 137); the adolescent runaway girl tends to leave school early and frequently marries early before the age of consent. (See also 69)

12
Wein, Bibi. The Runaway Generation. New York: McKay, 1970.

In this book the author gives her impressions, based on numerous interviews with youth on the two coasts, about the adolescent population of the late 1960's. Wein divides the real rebels of the late sixties into three, non-overlapping categories--dopers, street-dwellers, and radicals--, and concludes that there are really no "peaceniks" or "love" people in this "younger-than-hippie generation." In order to show that the teenagers of the late 1960 period are "quite unlike those of previous generations" (p. 26), Wein describes the late fifties' high school scene, of which the author was a member, in a suburban Philadelphia town and compares it with the attitudes, beliefs and behavior of high school students ten years later. She points out that the "would-be-beat generation" of the fifties was quite different than the youth of the hippie generation; "the dichotomy between beat and square was not one of the

Revolutionary versus the Pig, the Peace Marcher versus the Hawk, or even the turned on awareness versus the closed off" but the battle of the fifties' teenagers was one "of and against the middle class: the unique, the individualist, the non-conformist versus the mediocre, the ordinary" (p. 63).

One major issue on which Wein focuses in her descriptions of the sixties' youth from both coasts is drug use, "the most easily measurable index of this generation's differentness" (p. 77). Wein classifies the youth she met on the streets into three categories: (1) Trippies--youth without a commitment to or even an understanding of the street scene who are on the street "looking for action" but return to their homes at night after "tripping", (2) Street Kids--youth dropouts from society who have committed themselves to a street life of few comforts, panhandling and wandering like the older established street population, and (3) Runaways--youth who are on the street temporarily after deciding on "the spur of the moment" to leave home "after weeks or months or years of misery over a home or school situation, after frustration, irritation, torture, boredom, depression, whim "(p. 183). Wein points out that a runaway youth has made an independent decision to run to something or away from something, usually out of a very basic commitment to him/herself and his/her desires, needs and possible desperations. Some of the problems of youth on the run, as well as the services of the Diggers in Los Angeles and the Huckleberry House in San Francisco, are briefly described. From her informal study of youth, Wein concludes that adolescent revolt is not a natural stage of development but a situation that society creates by not giving youth responsibility and independence soon enough.

PROFESSIONAL JOURNALS (ENGLISH)

13
Ambrosino, Lillian. Runaways. Today's Education, 1971, 60, 26-28.

Ambrosino, a free-lance writer and author, briefly describes the plight of runaways in the United States today. A runaway is "any person below a specified age limit who has left his legal residence without the knowledge or consent of his parents or guardians" (p. 26). The age limit, which varies from state to state, is usually 18. Reliable statistics on runaways are hard to obtain. Most estimates are based on missing person records or police arrest files. It is reported that in 1970 at least one-half a million youth under 18 ran away. Ambrosino points out that anyone who helps a runaway can be prosecuted for contributing to the delinquency of a minor. The so-called "street runaways" - the desparate, rootless, and chronic runners who stay away - are the hardest to reach. In 1970 only five cities had halfway houses, while most cities had hotlines and free clinics. (See also 1)

14
Armstrong, Clairette, P. A psychoneurotic reaction of delinquent boys and girls. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1937, 32, 329-342.

The author, employed by the Domestic Relations Court of New York City, describes youths who are arraigned as delinquents in children's courts for running away from home or another place of abode. From the approximately 8,000 delinquents (ages 8 - 15) who were seen by the Children's Division of the New York City court each year, 660 runaway boys, described in Armstrong (1932), and 122 runaway girls located in court clinic records for 1932-1933 were compared and described. Of these 780 runaways, the average age was 13 - 1 years for boys and 14 - 4 years for girls; the average Stanford-Binet score was about 77; about 68% were behind grade level in school; about 44% were from unbroken homes and 20% from foster homes; 60% of the girls and 87% of the boys ran away alone, and 28% of the girls and 79% of the boys had run away more than once. Armstrong describes running away as a "psychoneurotic" reaction. She states that "running away from home is a strong intimation of a more or less continuous state of fear, distress and insecurity, aroused by various stimuli, from which crystallize an unfortunate and unstable make-up" (p. 332). Armstrong concludes that home deserters are generally "offspring of a low level of population, the majority immigrants, who establish unwholesome homes which

too often marked by extreme cruelty, immorality, disease and poor standards generally, where the stress of existence in a difficult urban environment causes disruption of the family and added disaster to the child, who, because of innate intellectual inferiority, cannot shoulder the burden of his scholastic and social environment" (pgs. 340-341). (See also 2)

15
Baer, Daniel J. Taxonomic classification of male delinquents from autobiographical data and subsequent recidivism. Journal of Psychology, 1970, 76 (1), 27-31.

Baer, a member of the psychology department of Boston College, describes a study in which 60 adjudicated Massachusetts "males", (ages 15½ - 17) who had no severe psychopathology or mental retardation were given a 75 item self-report Biographical Questionnaire one month prior to parole and one year later. A taxonomic analysis of the data revealed three groups. Although there were no significant associations between the groups and recidivism, a trend was noticed: the group lowest in recidivism had the lowest portion of stubborn children and runaways and the highest incidence of larceny-theft offenders.

16
Balser, B.H. A behavior problem--runaways. Psychiatric Quarterly, 1939, 13, 539-557.

Balser describes the runaways of all ages seen at the psychiatric clinic of the New York Traveler's Aid Society. Of 300 cases at the clinic, 89 were "behavior problem, runaways"; 59, schizophrenics; and 35, mentally defective. The reasons for the 89 individuals running away were the following: hereditary or emotional factors in the home (26), broken homes-children (19), young wives and mothers (13), undetermined (10), economic insecurity (9), specified physical and mental disorders (8), and adventure (4). Of the 89 runaways, 74 (83%) were under 21 years old with the peak age being seventeen (14 cases). Balser states that running away can be a positive step in problem solving for an individual.

17
Belkin, Alice. Why boys run away from home (Abstracts of Theses). Smith College Studies in Social Work, 1940, 11, 132-133.

For her masters thesis in social work, Belkin investigated the case histories of 11 boys (ages 9-16) who were brought to the Judge Baker Guidance Center in Boston because they frequently ran away. All these boys were neurotic and aggressive, and exhibited disturbed relationships with adults as well as abnormal psychosexual development. In each case the boy's relationship

with his parents was disturbed and ambivalent. Only one case was successfully treated. The prognosis for treatment was poor since the boys responded to anxiety in a treatment session by running away.

18
Blood, Linda, and D'Angelo, Rocco. A progress research report on value issues in conflict between runaways and their parents. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1974, 36, 486-491.

Blood (affiliated with the University of Rhode Island) and D'Angelo (affiliated with the School of Social Work, Ohio State University) describe the results of a pilot study which was designed to develop "an instrument that could discriminate between minor as opposed to major themes in conflictual behavior found in parent-child interaction" (p. 486). The study involved 60 runaway youth from a larger runaway study conducted during 1972-1973 (see 6) and 50 non-runaway youth who were non-randomly selected and substantially different from the runaways in a variety of ways. There was a significant difference in responses between the runaway and non-runaway youth on 15 (8 minor and 7 major) out of the 39 items (21 minor and 18 major) of the Value Issue Scale. Runaways, as compared to non-runaways, showed more intensity of conflict on the issues as well as conflict on a broader range of issues. The authors conclude that the runaways' responses suggest that key issues for runaways are those of parental acceptance, parental non-expression of love, and parents' failure to listen and communicate. (See also 6)

19
Canaday, Louis J. A way of predicting the probable outcome of treatment of young children who run away (Abstracts of Theses). Smith College Studies in Social Work, 1940, 11, 134.

For her masters thesis in social work, Canaday, at the Illinois Institute for Juvenile Research, studied 28 white runaway children under 12 years of age, whose cases had been treated and subsequently closed by the Social Services Department during the 1930's. Canaday reports the following significant facts: there were six boys for each girl, their ages were equally distributed between 7 and 11 years, and most had a low intelligence score. Two cases showed significant improvement; 9, slight improvement; 12, no improvement; and 5 dropped treatment. The author points out how the parental attitude towards the runaway event determines their attitude towards treatment. The parents (about two-thirds) who had rejecting attitudes towards treatment viewed running away as a symptom of the child's unhappiness or maladjustment, as incomprehensible behavior, as part of a delinquency pattern, or as a family trait. Those parents who saw running away as a symptom of their own failure as parents were more cooperative in treatment.

20
Chamberlin, Cecil R. Running away during psychotherapy. Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, 1960, 24, 288-294.

In this article psychiatrist Chamberlin presents a case study of a 14-year-old boy who ran away from a state hospital. The author discusses the implications of running away for the relationship between the therapist and patient. This analysis of the sympton of running away illustrates that the action met four needs of the boy: (1) need to show independence, (2) need to be loved, (3) need to raise self-esteem, and (4) need to express aggression toward authority.

21
Clarke, R.V.G. Approved school boy absconders and corporal punishment. British Journal of Criminology, 1966, 6, 364-375.

Clarke, an M.A. research worker at the Kingswood Classifying and Training Schools in Bristol, England, reports on the relationship between corporal punishment (caning) and absconding from the Kingswood Classifying School for the period 1960-1964. Absconding is defined as "any occasion of being absent from the school without permission, irrespective of duration of absence" (p. 365). During the five year time period studied, percent of admissions absconding ranged from 9.48% (1962) to 16.26% (1964), and the percent of "recovered absconds caned" ranged from 55.8% (1963) to 76% (1960). From his analyses, Clarke concludes that a boy was more likely to have been caned for absconding if (1) he had run away with others rather than by himself, (2) he had committed offenses while on the run for which he was not charged by the police, and (3) he had been gone for one day. Furthermore, caning was not related to (1) the number of times previously absconded, (2) age, (3) recidivism, (4) the number of days after admission in school, (5) caning for a previous absconding, and (6) the number of other abscondings in the period prior to the boy's recovery. (See also 22, 23, 60)

22
Clarke, R.V.G. Seasonal and other environmental aspects of absconding by approved school boys. British Journal of Criminology, 1967, 7, 195-202.

In this article Clarke, an M.A. research worker at the Kingswood Classifying and Training Schools in Bristol, England, examines the environmental factors related to absconding from the Kingswood Classifying School for boys for the five year period, 1960-1964. Absconding is defined as "being absent from school without permission, irrespective of duration of absence" (p. 196). Of the 4,096 admissions to the school during the five year period, there were 610 abscondings by 476 boys.

Clarke concludes that absconding (1) increased in the winter, which is best explained by the increase in hours of darkness, (2) was not related to rainfall, and (3) was slightly affected by the distance of the boy's home area. (See also 21, 23, 60)

23
Clarke, R.V.G. Absconding and adjustment to the training school. British Journal of Criminology, 1968, 285-295.

Clarke, an M.A. research worker at the Kingswood Classifying and Training Schools in Bristol, England, followed the records of 822 boys sent from the Kingswood Classifying School into various training schools in 1963. In the sample of 822 boys, 86 (10.5%) absconded from Kingswood and 318 (38.7%) absconded at least once in training school. Of these 318, 46 (5.6% of the 822) were persistent absconders, defined as those who "absconded at least once for each three months they were in school" (p. 287). From his analyses, Clarke concludes that boys who run away from one institution will generally run away from another. Specifically in this study, those boys with absconding records in classifying school and those boys who had previously been to a training school were more likely to be absconders (especially persistent ones) from training schools. Furthermore, boys who were persistent absconders from training school were most often sent to another approved school or to a detention center rather than receive a normal release under supervision. (See also 21, 22, 60).

24
Coleman, Richard, Racial differences in runaways. Psychological Reports, 1968, 22(1), 321-322.

In this study runaways from Lyman School, a training institution for male delinquents from 11 to 17 years of age, were described and compared by race, age, and total time as inmates. From a population of 4,748 male delinquents, there were 458 white and 58 black (total = 516) runaways during the five year period from September, 1960, to August, 1965. A "runaway" refers to "any boy who left or attempted to leave the school without permission, who fled from staff personnel while in transit, or who did not return as scheduled to the institution following a visit to his home" (p. 321). Although the blacks had been in the institution for a slightly longer time (6.2 months as compared to 7.0 months) the mean age of the runaways in both groups was 14.8 years. Black inmates accounted for significantly fewer runaways; they represented 24.6% of the total institution's population and only 11.2% of all runaways.

25
Crystal, David, and Gold, Irwin H. A social work mission to hippieland. Children, 1969, 16(1), 28-32.

In the "summer of love" (1967) in San Francisco the bay area Jewish Welfare Federation sponsored a special project under the joint auspices of the United Jewish Community Centers (Gold, executive director) and the Jewish Family Service Agency (Crystal, director). The project hired a female social worker and participant observer to work with the "hippies", including runaway youth, in the Haight-Asbury area. The social worker found that most of the large number of "hippies" in San Francisco in the summer of 1967 were between the ages of 14 and 34, the majority being between 17 and 22. A large number were from Jewish middle-class backgrounds. The runaways seen by the participant-observer are briefly mentioned -- where they came from, why they left, and where they were referred for services. Most of the article is concerned with the authors' impressions of hippies and the Hippie movement. Hippies are characterized as today's young Bohemians who "represent a protest against depersonalization, computerized thinking and doing, and above all, the distortion between people's daily living and their alleged ethics and values" (p. 32).

26
English, Clifford J. Leaving home: A typology of runaways. Society, 1973, 10, 22-24.

English presents his perceptions about runaways from his experiences as a counselor at Ozone House, a drop-in center for runaways in Ann Arbor, Michigan, in the early 1970's. Based on interviews and observations of over 300 runaways from August, 1970, to July, 1971, the following typology of runaways was constructed: floaters, runaways, splitters, and hard-road freaks. The floaters, those that return home after a few days, are the largest group of the adolescent street culture. A runaway is distinguished from a floater by the longer time he/she stays away. Some of the reasons why youths run away are "healthy" such as getting out of a destructive family situation. Other youth run to keep a secret or unshared problem such as pregnancy or to call attention and bring help to an unhappy family situation. "The splitters" refers to a specified pattern of runaways who stay home after returning each time until they become "bored", when they split just "for the hell of it" back to the deviant subculture. The hard road freaks are the street leaders, usually 17-20 years old, who have totally rejected the "straight world" and have been gone for many years. (See also 121)

27
Farrington, Donald S., Shelton, William, and MacKay, James R. Observations on runaway children from a residential setting. Child Welfare, 1963, 42, 286-291.

The authors, a psychiatrist and two social workers, describe 28 runaways (22 boys and 6 girls) from Spaulding Youth Center in Tilton, New Hampshire, an open residential institution for the care and treatment of emotionally disturbed children. The youth described had been gone from the center without permission for a combined total of 85 occasions for periods ranging from several hours to nineteen days. The average age of the runaways when admitted to the center was 13.5 years. The authors conclude from their clinical observations that "there is no single causal factor to explain the runaway behavior of this group of children" (p. 287). Four major constructs explaining why children ran away from the center are described: (1) crisis situations, (2) attention-getting, (3) withdrawal, (4) impaired family relationships. The group of runaways in the "impaired family relationships" class was the largest and most complex. Methods of managing runaway children in a residential setting are discussed. The authors state that a large number of children who have dealt with their home problems by running away can be helped in a residential setting by using the runaway behaviors therapeutically to help the child understand his relationship to his family.

28
Foster, Randall M. Intrapsychic and environmental factors in running away from home. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1962, 32, 486-491.

Foster, the Director of the Probation Department Psychiatric Clinic in Los Angeles, studied runaways who were brought before the Juvenile Court. The term "running away" is defined as "an absence from home, of any duration, at any time prior to the clinic study, which the subject himself refers to or accepts reference to as running away from home" (p. 487). Of 225 cases (144 boys and 81 girls) referred to the clinic in 1959-1960, there were 102 runaways (50 boys and 52 girls). The major portion of the study concerns the extensive comparison of 100 runaways (54 boys, 46 girls) with 75 nonrunaway delinquents seen by the author at the clinic. The most impressive significant difference between the experimental and control groups was the larger incidence of earlier parent-child separation for both the boy (49 out of 54 cases) and girl (42 out of 46 cases) runaways. The most frequent parent-child separation involved the child's father before the child was five, without subsequent return of the father. In addition the runaway group displayed more physical aggression and open sexual activity in the

home, more step-parents or adoptive parents, more mobility, more overt parental rejection of child, more truancy and deviant sexual behaviours. The author concludes that one important implication of his finding is the reaffirmation of the view that delinquent behavior is "a function of distrubed parent-child relationships rather than more remote environmental factors such as neighborhood characteristics" (p. 490).

29
Goldberg, Martin. The runaway Americans. Mental Hygiene, 1972, 56 (Winter), 13-19.

Psychiatrist Goldberg reports a study, carried out at the Traveler's Aid Society of Philadelphia, of "people in flight" - "people who have made or are carrying out unplanned geographical movements" (p. 13). From 1000 clients for which some data was collected, about 230 were classified as flight people, about 275 as first flight people, and about 250 as controls. The flight group consisted of people who had "carried out at least three unplanned or very poorly planned geographic moves in the five years prior to contacting Philadelphia Travelers Aid Society" (p. 14). No clients under 16 years of age were included in the study; 16% of the flight group, 18% of the control group, and 17.5% of the first flight group were under 20 years old. The first flight (71%) and flight (78%) groups were disproportionately high in males compared to the control group (55%).

While there was no significant difference between the flight group and controls in education or socioeconomic class, the flight group were more often ($p < .01$) divorced or separated, had more often ($p < .01$) never owned their own home, were living currently without paying for lodging ($p < .001$), and tended to have been unemployed from one to three years or to have held eight or more different jobs in the past five years ($p < .01$). From the clinical observations and tests, the flight people were noted as having patterns of excessive and chronic dependency, low and limited frustration tolerances, marked impulsivity, and a marked tendency to misrepresent themselves. In addition, the flight clients were generally "loners" and had significantly more diagnoses of mental illness, chiefly psychoses or personality disorders. Goldberg recommends that "half-way" house facilities for "flight" people should be available in the major urban areas across the country.

30
Goldmeier, John, and Dean, Robert D. The runaway: person, problem or situation? Crime and Delinquency, 1973. 19(4), 539-544. (Also in United States Senate, Hearings on Runaway Youth before the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary. 92nd Congress, 1st session. Pp. 233-238. January 13-14, 1972).

Goldmeier, an associate professor at Maryland's School of Social Work and Community Planning, and Dean, a M.S.W. juvenile probation counselor in Montgomery County, Maryland, describe a study in which they compared 57 youths (20 boys and 37 girls, ages 12-18), who ran away from home in Montgomery County, Maryland, in the summer of 1971 with 68 non-runaway youths (25 boys and 43 girls). A runaway is defined as "a boy or girl who left home without parental permission" (p. 541). Results of a self-administered, confidential questionnaire completed by the youths suggest that "runaway behavior reflects a complex of factors and that an overly narrow focus on either the runaway or his situation is insufficient as a basis for understanding and helping him" (p. 543).

Only three of fourteen identifying demographic questions revealed significant differences between runaways and non-runaways. "Runaways tended to be older than non-runaways, in vocational and non-academic programs at school and from homes where one of the natural parents was absent" (p. 541). The two groups were not different on variables such as number of children in family, sex, sibling composition in family, and parent occupation or income level. In addition, runaways (1) tended to feel like running away when upset, (2) received poorer grades and had more differences with teachers in school, (3) tended to be less at ease at home and less warm towards their parents, and (4) turned to peers when in trouble. All the youth in the study had reasonably high self-concepts and were quite positive about their problem-solving abilities and peer relationships. The authors conclude that "it may be possible to view the runaway act as a situational response and a positive aspect of coping, where support is sought from peers rather than from the adult-dominated environment of the family or the school" (p. 543).

31
Gordon, James S. Coming together: Consultation with young people. Social Policy, 1974 (July/August), 40-52.

Gordon, a psychiatrist with the Public Health Service, describes his evolving role as a consultant to alternative social services for youth, mostly runaways. The article focuses on two alternative youth programs in the Washington, D.C. area--

a suburban hotline and an urban group foster home. The author states that a mental health professional who works with young people on alternative projects must understand the youth's needs, aspirations, ideals and expectations as well as his or her own. In addition, professional training guarantees neither acceptance nor usefulness to alternative service projects. The author describes his ecological and political approach by giving many examples of his collective meetings with the staffs of the two alternative youth projects. Gordon attributes his usefulness to these projects to his recognition along with them of the "impovishment of traditional services" and his "sense that alternative services which are controlled by people in them, not by a bureaucratic or professional hierarchy, offer a new and better way for people" (p. 43). (See also 101, 108)

32
Gothberg, Laura C. A comparison of the personality of runaway girls with a control group as expressed in the themes of Murray's Thematic Apperception Test. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1947, 51, 627-631.

Gothberg, a MA psychologist at the Mansfield State Training School in Connecticut, describes a study in which she compared the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) scores of ten females who had runaway at least twice from the institution to those of ten female non-runaways who were matched in age, intelligence, and body build (height and weight). The mean age of the twenty females was about 20 years old, with the range being 14-11 to 25-0 years. The range of all females' IQ scores was from 49 to 68. Gothberg found that the runaways related to the experimenter more warmly than the controls. In addition, the total number of ideas expressed by the runaways was almost 30 percent more than the non-runaways, even though the total number of different ideas was equal. The runaways expressed the same theme as many as six times during a TAT session, while the controls never repeated one theme more than four times. The two most recurring themes for both groups were "need for love and protection" (runaways - 33 times; controls - 13 times) and "self-aggression" (runaways - 24 times; controls - 15 times). The runaways also used the following themes more than ten times: conflict with parents (16 times), aggression toward female (15 times), female as aggressive (14 times), and desire to conform (12 times).

33
Green, J.R., & Martin, D.M. Absconding from approved schools as learned behavior: A statistical study. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 1973, 10(1), 73-86.

Statistician Green and psychologist Martin discuss whether absconding, defined as running away from an institution, is a learned behavior rather than a reflection of individual differences.

The sample analyzed included 244 boys (ages 13 to 15) who had never run away from home and who were admitted to an intermediate training school in England between May, 1964, and November, 1967. Using sophisticated statistical methodologies to understand the 76 absconders' behavior, the authors found no evidence that absconding is learned and some evidence that the sample was hetrogeneous at the onset in runaway tendencies. Instead of a chance distribution, the frequency distribution for absconding appeared to be negative binomial one.

34
Green, Mark J. Runaways on the legal leash. Trial, 1971, 7(5), 28-29.

Green, a lawyer, presents an overview of the law regarding children and youth, especially runaways. Until 1967, and decisions in the Kent and Gault case, the law disregarded children. They were considered "enfants terribles" who were in need of training and social control. Consequently, schools exhibited "in loco parentis" over them and courts exercised "parents patriae" over them, while the family's economic support bound them to the home. Almost every state has a "runaways" statute which forbids youth, usually defined as under 21, from leaving home without parental consent and which provides for police intervention, if necessary, to retrieve them" (p. 28). The most common estimate is that there are about one million runaways under 21, half of which are under 17. Green points out that the present runaway statutes violate three notions of civil liberties which the United States gives to adults: (1) right of personal freedom to live where one wants; (2) "right to be left alone"; and (3) "right to travel."

35
Greene, Nancy B., and Esselstyn, T.C. The beyond control girl. Juvenile Justice, 1972, 23 (3), 13-19.

In this article, Greene, a social worker who is the probation supervisor in Santa Clara County, California, and Esselstyn, professor of sociology at the California State University at San Jose, discuss so-called "beyond control" girls. "Beyond control" usually refers to "ungovernable, unmanageable, incorrigible" and/or juvenile behaviors which are considered "displeasing, baffling, defiant or threatening." The authors point out that a great deal of subjectivity enters the decision to call a juvenile "beyond control" as opposed to a law violator. In the case of females, the term often is considered a synonym for sexual precocity. The authors discuss five principal areas of beyond control behavior among females: school, unwed pregnancy, sex delinquency, runaways, and incorrigible. Often so-called incorrigible children are cast as the family scapegoat or identified as the family patient.

Runaways are divided into three groups: (1) the Rootless -- These pleasure-seeking and hedonistic youth who lack self-discipline, cannot see the consequences of their behavior, and have peer relations characterized by impermanency and lack of trust, run away from home to rebel; (2) The Anxious -- These youth who feel anxious, depressed and powerless are unable to handle their own and family problems and run away, often to a friend's house nearby, in hopes of seeking help for their own and family problems; (3) The Terrified -- These youth who often have a poor self-image and are victims of some extenuating circumstance such as alcoholic parents, parental abuse and neglect, and/or incest, run away because of the threat on their life and an awareness of the situation in which they are caught.

36
Gunasekara, M.G.S. The problem of absconding in boys' approved schools in England and Wales. British Journal of Criminology, 1963, 4, 145-51.

Gunasekara, a social scientist at the University of Wales, reports on "an investigation into the problems of absconding in approved schools, based on a survey of 19 absconders and 25 non-absconders ranging from 13 to 16 years of age, chosen at random from the approved (training) schools in England and Wales" (p. 145). An approved training school is an open institution from which boys can run from custody whenever they want. An absconder is "one who runs away from such custodial care during his period of detention" (p. 145). A "presistent absconder" is a runaway who had run away five times or more, with an interval of six months or more between the first and the last times; any other runaway is called a "casual absconder."

Although the study showed marked differences in 18 characteristics between the persistent absconders and the casual absconders and between the persistent absconders and the non-absconders, there were no striking differences between the casual absconders and the non-absconders. "All persistent absconders were 'rootless boys' and confirmed truants from school" (p. 147), who committed larceny while absconding. Both the absconders and non-absconders were educationally retarded from one to four years and had average IQ's in the 80's. The author concludes that the environment of the institution is "the more potent factor" in the casual absconder, while "in the persistent absconder it is his personality make-up that is more potent while the institutional setting acts rather as a stimulus to abscond" (p. 151).

37
Haupt, Donald N., and Offord, David R. Runaways from a residential treatment center: A preliminary report. Corrective Psychiatry and Journal of Social Therapy, 1972, 18, 14-21.

Haupt and Offord, doctors at the Milton S. Hershey Center of Pennsylvania State University, describe a study in which 57 youths (40 males and 17 females), who ran away between January 1, 1966, and April 15, 1970 from the Hoffman House for Children, a residential treatment center for emotionally disturbed and delinquent youth, in Littlestown, Pennsylvania, were compared to 35 non-runaway youths (29 males and 6 females) at the home during the same period. The average age of the youth at the time of admission to the center was 13.0 years for the males and 13.5 years for the females. The runaways studied were white youth of lower middle to lower socioeconomic backgrounds. A runaway is defined as "any unauthorized absence from the campus of the home with intent of the child either to leave the home temporarily or permanently, or to cause the staff of the home to pursue him" (p. 16).

There were a total of 117 male runs and 46 female runs; each runner averaged close to three runs each; and the average run was approximately two days. The findings revealed that the male runners experienced a greater number of foster home placements and experimental hardships than the male non-runaways, while the opposite was true for females ($p < .05$). In addition, the boys ran more than expected by chance in the fall and winter and less in the spring and summer, while the opposite pattern was true for females ($p < .005$). Finally, the boys had an excess number of short runs (those less than overnight) in the fall and winter and less than the expected number in the spring and summer, while the pattern was reversed for females ($p < .001$). The seasonal variation findings suggested to the authors that a meaningful concept for differentiating runaway behavior might be to think of runaway incidents in terms of "gestures", a short "cry for help" in which the child usually returns or allows himself to be found within 12 to 18 hours versus "real runs", a run which lasts at least overnight with the intention of getting away.

38
Hiatt, Catherine C., and Spurlock, Ruth E. Geographical flight and its relation to crisis theory. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1970, 40, 53-57.

Hiatt and Spurlock, social workers with the Washington, D.C. Travelers Aid Society, describe an increasingly large number of mobile people whom they see who evidence "crisis-flight" behavior --

"a definite pattern of travel wherein 'motionless' and geographical fleeing have become a characteristic episodic way of coping -- characteristic of a way of life or lifestyle" (p. 53). Within a six month period in 1970, approximately two-thirds of the Travelers Aid clients in D.C. were somewhere in the crisis-flight category. All were able to function somewhat adequately on the flight and minimally when not moving. The characteristics of the group seem close to those described for wanderlust. "The destination is both unimportant and nebulous, the quest is illusory, and there are no satisfactions upon arrival anywhere" (p. 56). The authors recommend the need for research to understand the etiology and characteristics of crisis-flight, and the need for developing techniques to manage and/or prevent it.

39
Hildebrand, James A. Why runaways leave home. Journal of Criminal Law Criminology, and Police Science, 1963, 54(2), 211-216.

Hildebrand, a detective assigned to the Missing Persons Unit of the New York Police Department, reports his study of 262 runaways (133 boys and 129 girls) from six precincts located in southwest Brooklyn, a predominantly lower middle income area. A runaway is defined as "a subject under 18 years of age who leaves home without parental consent, and who is reported to the police as a missing person" (p. 211). Hildebrand calls a runaway "a second generation delinquent" and reports that seventy percent of all delinquents have run away at one time or another. The age range of the 262 runaways studied was 8 to 17 years old; from age 12 both sexes showed an increase in the number of runaway incidents until age 16, at which time the number of boy runaways dropped off considerably while the number of girl runaways continued to increase. Poor home environment was the major reason for running away in the 8 to 12 year old group. From age 13 on, family discipline was the major factor. Problems with school, characterized by poor grades, misconduct and truancy, was the next most important reason. Pregnancy and early marriage were main reasons for the older girls running away. Hildebrand concludes that "if crime prevention programs are to be effective it is imperative that the family recognize the early signs of maladjustment in children": the most visible problem indicator is the runaway, "the seed of the future felon" (p. 216). (See also 40)

40
Hildebrand, James A. Reasons for Runaways. Crime and Delinquency, 1968, 14(1), 42-48.

In this article Hildebrand, a sergeant with the New York City Police Department, compares the runaway problem in two New York City precincts. Based on missing persons records for ages 10 - 17, Precinct A, a low-income and high-crime area, had

a runaway rate of 2.36 per thousand population (107 males and 142 females), while Precinct B, a middle-income area, had a rate of 0.37 per thousand (22 males and 18 females). The city-wide rate was 0.93 per thousand population. Children in Precinct A began to run away at a significantly earlier age than those in Precinct B. Even though the runaway pattern for boys in both areas was similar, it varied for the girls. In Precinct A the parents adopted a nonchalant attitude towards a child's absence, while in Precinct B the parents actively participated in the search for their child. Forty-one percent of the cases in Precinct A involved recidivists as compared to only twenty-seven percent in Precinct B.

Factors which influence the youths behavior are "family instability, neighborhood deterioration, low income and economic dependency, and a low level of education" (p. 48). The parents attitude towards education seemed to be a crucial factor. Parents in the high rate area were apathetic toward education and in some cases did not know the name or location of the runaway's school. Hildebrand concludes that "the runaway rate may be a reliable indicator of delinquency trends and that an intensive study of the runaway may provide us with valuable information concerning the etiology of the juvenile delinquent" (p. 48). (See also 39)

41
Homer, Louise E. Community-based resource for runaway girls. Social Casework, 1973, 54(8), 473-479.

Homer, Assistant Executive Director of Youth Opportunities Upheld, Inc., in Worcester, Massachusetts, describes her work with twenty young girls between the ages of thirteen and sixteen, who were classified as runaways on the basis of their history with the Worcester juvenile court. All of the girls had a history of staying away from home for periods of time ranging from three days to nine months and all had runaway at least three times. All were from lower and lower-middle class families, of which fourteen were on welfare. The therapeutic intervention for each girl included: (1) individual therapy once a week, (2) a coed counseling group twice a week, and (3) family therapy every other week.

Homer discusses the girl runaways in two district categories: those who were running from (n=7) and those who were running to (n=14). The running-from category includes those who had run away to "cool-off" and escape unresolved intrapersonal and family problems. These runaways were helped considerably by the three-part therapeutic intervention of insight-oriented and family therapy. The running-to category includes the "pleasure-seekers" who were running from home to places and people who provided a variety of experiences forbidden at home.

These runaways, who felt indifferent about their family situation and had serious difficulty internalizing controls, did not benefit at all from the three-part therapeutic intervention. Homer recommends that girls in the running-to group need more confrontation therapy with an emphasis on the setting of limits as well as more treatment in good closed-treatment facilities. The two groups of runaways were found to differ significantly on three out of four variables: (1) place where run to, (2) verbalized reason for running, and (3) recividism and commitment. There were no significant differences between them in the number of parents living in the home.

42
Howell, Mary C., Emmons, E.B., and Frank, D.A. Reminiscences of runaway adolescents. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1973, 43(5), 840-853.

This article reports a retrospective study of runaways' perceptions of the experience of running away - reasons for leaving home, problems encountered on the run, benefits derived, and plans for the future. The investigators, who are associated with the Behavior Unit, Children's Service of the Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston, traced 41 out of a possible 334 eligible runaways with recorded visits to Project Place in Boston in the year 1970. An eligible runaway in this study had to have "run away for three or more days from 'stable' two-parent families" (p. 843). These 41 runaways (18 girls and 23 boys) were interviewed by telephone more than a year after they had run away from home. The boys' mean age (15-5 years) at the time of running was not significantly different from that of the girls' (16-6 years). The range of ages for both sexes was 12-7 to 17-10 years. The majority of youth were from middle-class families. Every one of the youths interviewed described difficulties with parents and/or school before running away. The problems of the youth on the run varied widely. The majority (78% of the boys and 61% of the girls) stated they enjoyed the experience at the time. Most of the runaways felt that their lives in general were better at the time of the interview than before they had run away. The authors point out that at least a small subsample of 15 runaways (which represented less than 6% of all those who visited Boston in 1970) were not at all harmed by the runaway experience and used it as an opportunity to grow. In addition, "many adolescents seem to have chosen to run away as a self-determined approach to the resolution of family conflict" (p. 853).

43
Jahr, Herman M. Running away. Hygeia, 1940, 18, 145-148, 156-157.

Jahr describes four instances of children running away from home. He points out that all children who run away do so for a reason which is usually unclear to their parents. These reasons include search for adventure, escape from unpleasant and burdensome surroundings, fear of facing reality, and expression of self in an environment where one has little control.

44
Jenkins, Richard L. Classification of behavior problems of children. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1969, 125(8), 1032-1039.

The second edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-II) of the American Psychiatric Association lists the following seven subcategories under the category "behavior disorders of childhood": hyperkinetic reaction, withdrawing reaction, overanxious reaction, runaway reaction, unsocialized aggressive reaction, group delinquent reaction and other reaction. In this article Dr. Jenkins describes briefly the characteristics of the first six categories, those which represent clinically recognizable symptomatic clusters supported by research studies. Children who belong in the "runaway reaction" group "repeatedly run away from home overnight. They are timid and furtive and inclined to stealing, particularly stealing in the home " (p. 1035). Furthermore, they are seclusive, apathetic and chronically rejected at home. "Typically, there is a gross lack of self-confidence and a very poor self-image. The unwanted illegitimate child is very common in this group, and only child status is extremely common" (p. 1035). Jenkins states that treatment of these children is very difficult and must involve the home. (See also 45, 46, 47, 77, 86)

45
Jenkins, Richard L. The runaway reaction. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1971, 128(2), 168-173.

Three of the subcategories - runaway reaction, unsocialized aggressive reaction, and group delinquent reaction - of the American Psychiatric Association's category "behavior disorders of children" relate to behavior that is technically delinquent. In this article psychiatrist Jenkins describes the characteristics of the runaway reaction group and several research studies with delinquent boys in training schools which compare the runaway reaction to the other two delinquent categories. The APA's revised Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders describes the runaway reaction as follows:

> Individuals with this disorder characteristically escape from threatening situations by running away from home for a day or more without permission. Typically they are immature and timid, and feel rejected at home, inadequate, and friendless. They often steal furtively. (p. 61)

Even though the runaway reaction and the unsocialized aggressive reaction are maladaptive frustration, responses to a very unsatisfying home situation, the runaway reaction is a reaction of flight while the unsocialized aggressive reaction is a reaction of flight. The runaway's behavior is dominated by fear rather than by hostility and anger. Compared with the group delinquent reaction, the runaway reaction is more difficult to treat as it represents more personality pathology. Jenkins states that effective treatment of the runaway reaction requires (1) modification of, or removal from, the home environment, and (2) a substantial period in an accepting but firm environment. (See also 44, 46, 47, 77, 86)

46
Jenkins, Richard L., and Boyer, Andrew. Types of delinquent behavior and background factors. International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 1968, 14, 65-76.

In this article Jenkins and Boyer, affiliated with the University of Iowa, present the results of secondary analyses on data collected from 300 boys committed to the New York State Training School for Boys at Warwick, New York, in the early 1930's. A computerized clustering procedure on all the behavior and sympton items recorded for each boy's case revealed three essentially uncorrelated clusters of behavior: (1) the socialized co-operative delinquent, (2) the unsocialized runaway delinquent, and (3) the unsocialized aggressive delinquent. The investigators conclude that the runaway delinquent has the least organized personality, the cooperative delinquent - the most organized. The runaway boy's delinquency was most associated with strong peer group influences. (See also 44, 45, 47, 77, 86)

47
Jenkins, Richard L., and Stahle, Galen. The runaway reaction: A case study. Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 1972, 11(2), 294-313.

After a brief review of the runaway literature, psychiatrists Jenkins and Stahle present an extensive case study of a male runaway who exhibited 22 years of "maladaptive nomadism," from age 11 to his death at age 33. The literature acknowledges that an unpleasant home situation is often a cause of running away, that delinquent acts other than running away are more common in runaways than non-runaways, and that the most common personal

characteristics observed of runaways are insecurity, depression or unhappiness, and impulsivity. Even though it is difficult to conclude to what extent a runaway is attracted by adventure and to what extent he/she is repelled by his/her home, the authors feel that the latter is more important, at least in repetitive runaways. (See also 44, 45, 46, 77, 86)

48

Joos, J., Debuyst, C., and Sepulchre-Cassiers, M. Boys who run away from home: A Belgian study. International Journal of Offender Therapy, 1970, 14(2), 89-104.

The results of interviews with twenty Belgian runaway boys (ages 15-18) are reported in this article. A runaway is defined as one who "stayed away from home at least one night and had been charged before a juvenile court for truancy" (p. 99). It was found that all but two wanted to leave for good and most hesitated extensively before leaving. The majority (65%) of the runaways stated that they enjoyed the flight. In general, they were motivated by long periods of dissatisfaction and indecision at home rather than defiance and felt they were not understood or wanted at home. The authors conclude that the runaways seemed to suffer from depression and strong inner tensions, which were compensated by an active fantasy life, and that they were constantly dissatisfied and searching for something new and/or better.

49

Kahn, Kenneth L. The runaway from residential treatment: A synthesis of relevant data. (Abstracts of Masters Theses, July, 1973). Smith College Studies in Social Work, 1973, 44(1), 21-22.

In his master's thesis Kahn collected and analyzed original data about adolescent runaways from five residential treatment centers according to key issues and questions he generated from a literature search about adolescent runaways from home, psychiatric hospitals and correctional institutions. Each center's clinical administrator filled out a form for each runaway incident which paid "special attention to institutional consequences contingent on runaway behavior, to the nature of the 'contract' under which the child was admitted, and to the 'type' of runaway as defined by certain criteria" (p. 22). Kahn concludes from the results that "future experimentation might yield a classification of types of runaways as well as guidelines for the therapeutic management of each type" (p. 22).

50
Kaufman, Joshua, Allen, James R., and West, Lewis, J. Runaways, hippies, and marijuana. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1969, 126, 163-166.

In the "summer of love" (1967) in San Francisco a research team of psychiatrists and college undergraduate and graduate students, sponsored by the Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation, converted a large apartment in the Haight-Asbury district into a combination home, office, laboratory, commune, and "crash-pad" where transients (including runaway teenagers) could spend the night. Most of the runaways who were seen by the authors had run from home and their high schools because they felt rejected and alienated from society. They were not involved much in delinquent acts, except for their use of illegal drugs - especially marijuana. Some of the runaways were really "push-aways", youth who had "received either covert or overt parental sanction to leave, expressed as scorn, indifference, or obvious envy" (p. 165). The role of marijuana among the runaways was complex; most of a runaway's day in Haight Asbury evolved around drug use - getting it, taking it and talking about it. The authors suggest that most of the summer runaways would eventually return to "straight" society. In conclusion the authors state that "the youngster who runs away, whether his trip be geographical, pharmacological, or both, can best be understood in terms of the interaction of significant intra-psychic maturational variables, current sociocultural factors, and the all-important relationship of the child to his parents" (p. 720).

51
Keogh, Cornelia R. A study of runaways at a state correctional school for boys. Journal of Juvenile Research, 1935, 19, 45-61.

Keogh describes the findings of a study in which the records of 200 boys who ran away from Whittier State School, a California correctional school for boys (ages 8 - 16) during the period from January 1, 1928, to December 30, 1933, were examined and compared to 400 consecutive admissions to the school from 1928 to 1930. For the analysis a runaway was defined as a person who was "officially recorded as having attempted to run and who succeeded in leaving the grounds" (p. 45). The runaway and control groups were very similar with respect to Stanford-Binet intelligence levels, median ages, mean entrance age, and racial composition. When the 315 episodes of running away for the 200 boys were analyzed, it was found that 61% of the boys left only once, 25.5%, twice; slightly more (26.2%) left in fall than in any other season; and two-thirds of the runs occurred between 3.75 months after admission and 9.75 months after entrance. Compared to controls (C), runaways (R) had a

higher incidence of (1) broken homes (R - 61%, C - 57%), (2) step-parents in home (R - 76.5%, 14.5%), (3) school truancy (R - 61.5%, C - 35%), (4) running away from home (R - 62%, C-- 51.5%), and (5) unsatisfactory post-institutional adjustment (R - 46%, C - 38%). The percentage of runaways among the total institutional population was 17.29% between 1928 and 1933; in contrast, in the previous years from 1919 to 1927 when there was less freedom and more penalities for running away, the percentage was about 4.8.

52
Kessler, Clemm C., and Wieland, Joan. Experimental study of risk-taking behavior in runaway girls. Psychological Reports, 1970, 26(3), 810.

Kessler and Wieland from the University of Nebraska at Omaha report a study in which they compared the risk-taking behavior of six runaways and six non-runaway girls from a local girls' home. All of the girls were from 14 to 17 years old. The risk-taking task used involved increasing the certainty of guessing the identity of an object at the risk of a loss of money as the number of clues increased. Using this task, the antithesis of the investigators' hypothesis was found: the non-runaway girls were greater risk-takers than the runaways.

53
Leventhal, Theodore. Control problems in runaway children. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1963, 9, 122-126.

Leventhal, chief psychologist at the Worcester Youth Guidance Center in Worcester, Massachusetts, suggests that running away is one type of extreme, desperate behavior which can result when there is imminent danger of total loss of environmental or outer control. Outer uncontrol is "usually manifested in a preoccupation with environmental influences, frequent and/or intense behavioral reactions to them, extreme expectations of submission, such as becoming a puppet or a slave, and experiences of powerlessness as expressed in statements reflecting lack of choice and being coerced" (p. 123). In this study, reported comparisons of 42 runaways (27 boys and 15 girls), ages 5-16 years (median age = 13.5 years), and 42 nonrunaway matched children, chosen from the general child guidance clinic population, were made for each of three outer uncontrol scales (Scale I: External Influence, Scale C: Counteracting Influences, Scale N: No Influence Over Others) as well as the sum of the scales.

To be included in the runaway group a child had (1) to be 17 years of age or younger, (2) to have been absent from home without permission of his parents one or more times, (3) to have had no history of delinquent acts that would have brought the child to the attention of the police prior to running away, and (4) to have begun evaluation within one month of running away. As hypothesized, the runaways significantly ($p < .01$)

rated above the non-runaways on all the external uncontrol scales. A common theme to all of the runaways' initial reasons for leaving was "lack of respect for the child and a feeling of being abused and being taken advantage of" (p. 126). Leventhal concludes that the runaways' marked overconcern with loss of control and with ego surrender suggests prepsychotic functioning and severe pathology. (See also 54)

54
Leventhal, Theodore. Inner control deficiencies in runaway children. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1964, 11, 170-176.

In the study reported by Leventhal, Director of Research, Children's Psychiatric Center in Eatontown, New Jersey, comparisons of 42 runaways (27 boys and 15 girls), aged 5 to 16 years (with median age = 13.5 years), and 42 non-runaway matched children from a child guidance clinic population were made on an inner uncontrol scale which was initially developed from interview data. The criteria for being included in the runaway group were the same as those of the previous study of outer uncontrol (Leventhal, 1963). As hypothesized, the runaway group showed significantly ($p < .001$) more inner uncontrol (mean rating = 4.7) on a seven point scale than did the non-runaway group (mean rating = 2.9). Contrary to what might have been expected, the police runaway referrals had lower uncontrol ratings than runaways referred to the clinic by parents or nonpunitive agencies. Runaways gave "more indications of discharge-type behavior, of deficient regulatory mechanisms, and of a 'helpless' self-image" (p. 176). In addition, there was a 'significant' although moderate, correlation (+0.45) between the inner uncontrol scale and the outer uncontrol scales reported in an earlier study. (See also 53)

55
Levine, Stanley. Runaways and research in the training school. Crime and Delinquency, 1962, 8, 40-45.

During July and August, 1959, Levine, Clinic Director of the Illinois State Training School for Boys, studied a sample of 74 runaway boys who had been "on unauthorized absence from the institution at any time during a sixteen-month period in 1958 and 1959" (p. 41). Four significant differences between the runaway sample and the total training school population were found. The runaway sample had more white boys (91% vs. 55%), more returnees (54% vs. 40%), more rural or downstate commitments (45% vs. 32%), and more in the training school less than thirty days (31% vs. 23%) than the total institutional population. Most runaways occurred during warm weather and vacation period. There was no difference on the Beta Intelligence

Test between a random sample of 34 runaways and 34 matched non-runaways. The Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale did not differentiate between runaways who had been in the school for less than 30 days and those who had been there longer. Boys committed to the institution for assault were less likely to runaway than boys committed for the use of narcotics and alcohol. As a result of this study several institutional policies and practices, such as those concerning orientation and vacations, were changed which subsequently significantly reduced the number of runaways.

56
Levinson, Boris M., and Mezei, Harry. Self-concepts and ideal self-concepts of run-away youth: Counselling implications. Psychological Reports, 1970, 26(3), 775-783.

Levinson and Mezei at the Yeshiva University describe 25 male youths (ages 16-20) or approximately 10% of the homeless youths seen at a private Emergency Shelter in New York during 1967-1968. All the youths were from lower-middle or upper-lower class homes. None was a juvenile delinquent. Ninety percent were from physically broken homes shattered by either death or desertion and ten percent from psychologically broken homes. Each youth rated himself on 19 seven-point scales (9 evaluative, 6 potency, and 5 activity) as (a) "I really am" and as (b) "I would like to be". The largest discrepancies between the youths' actual and ideal self-concepts were found for the evaluative factor (mean scores: 2.9 vs. 1.3) followed by the activity (3.4 vs. 1.9) and potency (3.4 vs. 2.3) factors. Based on these findings, the authors suggest a goal of counselling these youths should be the development of self-esteem, self-acceptance and meaning in their lives. Unless these youths are properly handled, the authors state, "they may become the future homeless men who will either inhibit our shrinking skid rows or cheap rooming houses" (p. 871).

57
Levy, Edwin Z. Some thoughts about patients who run away from residential treatment and the staff they leave behind. Psychiatric Quarterly, 1972, 46(1), 1-21.

Whether running away is a necessary element in building a therapeutic alliance is the basic issue discussed in this article by Levy, who is Director of Research, Children's Division, at the Menninger Foundation in Topeka, Kansas. After an extensive presentation of running away as seen in fiction, social theories and social research, Levy describes the 16 runaway female patients (out of a total of 42 patients) seen during nine years (11/61 to 10/70) at the female adolescent unit of the Menninger Foundation Children's Hospital. Five non-inclusive descriptive categories are used to highlight different but overlapping treatment issues

relating to the runaways: angry defiance (n=4), psychotic disorganization (n=4), escape (n=2), to go on one's own (n=5), and fusion with parents (n=1). The adopted female patients were a high runaway risk group; of the eleven patients who were adopted, eight ran away at least once. Levy remarks that all the runaways backgrounds had prominent abandonment themes, such as adoption, parental death, family lives, and parental travel. There was a slight tendency for the best adjusted after discharge not to run away, but the overall difference in adjustment between the runaway and non-runaway groups was not large.

58
Lowrey, Lawson G. Runaways and nomads. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1941, 11, 775-782.

Dr. Lowrey presents a profile of the approximately 2,756 "runaway cases" seen during the five-year period 1935 - 1939 at the New York Travelers Aid Society. The definition of a runaway is quite broad since it includes older individuals "absent from accustomed surroundings without consent or knowledge, particularly if incapacitated in any way" (p. 775). The age range of the runaway cases was from 6 to 102 years, with only 9% being 21 years or older. The majority were teenagers, with 16 year olds representing the largest group (19.4%). In all, 56% were males; males predominated at the early ages while after 18 years old, females were the majority.

The majority of clients ran away because they were unhappy and felt unwanted and rejected at home. Many had inadequate and troubling parent-child and sibling relationships. The majority of runaways returned home. To most clients running away is illustrative of the mechanism of "fleeing the unpleasant for a situation known to be or hoped to be more satisfying emotionally and socially" (p. 781). A small number of nomads, or chronic wanderers, were included in the runaway group. When nomadism is not attributable to economic needs, it is most commonly ascribed to schizophrenia of the simple dementing type.

59
Lubeck, Steven G., and Empey, Lamar T. Mediatory vs. total institution: The case of the runaway. Social Problems 1968, 16(2), 242-260.

Lubeck and Empey, social scientists at the University of Southern California, report a study concerned with the prediction and control of runaways at two correctional institutions for delinquent boys. Boys, ages 15 to 18 years old, from a common population of repeat offenders were randomly assigned to either a mediatory institution (n = 131) located in an urban community

or an isolated and relatively self-sufficient total institution (n = 93). Running away, defined as "any unauthorised leave of absence that lasts longer than a period of 24 hours (p. 246)" was examined over a 32 month period in both correctional facilities.

Stepwise regression analyses, used to examine the relationship of 30 predictor variables (nine indices of psychological characteristics, eight social background scales, five peer relations scales and eight offense scales) to runaway behavior at each institution, showed that there was a complex interaction among the organizational characteristics of the programs, the personal characteristics of the boys, and the occurrence of runaways. Even though the runaway rates at both institutions were relatively high and almost equal (37% at the mediatory institution and 39% at the total institution), the explained variance for the total institutional sample (36%) was almost double that of the mediatory institutional sample (20%). As a group, the offense scales accounted for the largest percent (41% and 50%) of the explained variance in both institutions. Further analyses showed differences in runaway behavior were made before and after changes in policies at both institutions. The authors conclude that runaway behavior in these institutions could not be predicted solely on the boys' personal attributes without considering the dynamics of the correctional institution in which they were living.

60
Martin, D.N., and Clarke, R.V.G. The personality of approved school absconders. British Journal of Criminology, 1969, 9, 366-375.

Martin, Senior Psychologist at Red Bank Schools in Lancs, and Clarke, Ph.D. Research Worker at the Kingswood Schools in Kingswood, report the findings of three studies in which the absconders from English training schools during 1965-1967 were compared to non-absconders on a variety of personality tests. Absconding is defined as "any unauthorized absence from school irrespective of its duration" (367). In the first study 78 boys (out of 184 consecutive admissions to 23 training schools) who absconded at least once did not differ significantly from the non-absconders (n=106) in psychomotor style as measured by the Spiral Maze Test, and in extraversion and neuroticism as measured by the Junior Maudsley Personality Inventory. The groups were comparable in terms of age, intelligence, and reading level.

In the second study, in a sample of 50 randomly selected matched pairs there were no significant differences on the Jesness Inventory mean raw subscale scores nor the derived Asocial Index between absconders and non-absconders from the classifying school. In the third study, there were no significant differences on the High School Personality Questionnaire between 59 absconders from

the classifying school and 59 randomly selected non-absconders. The general conclusion from these studies is that "absconders are a random sample from the approved school population as far as personality variables are concerned" (p. 372). (See also 21, 22, 23)

61
Miller, Abraham. On the road: Hitchhiking on the highway. Society, 1973, 10(5), 14-21.

This article discusses the plight and characteristics of young vagabonds, as divided into three categories--students, road and street people, and runaways. The findings are based on approximately 90 interviews in the San Francisco bay area and the questionnaire data of 207 youth who participated in a free dinner program at the First Baptist Church in Berkeley. The student tends to view his experiences on the road as "a demonstration of his independence and ability to survive at a minimum economic level by his wits and restraint" (p. 15). Compared to students, the road people are "modern gypsies" who have chosen an itinerant life, living at subsistence level, and "dropped out" from the desires and security of "middle class society". In contrast to the road people, street people "whose main concerns evolve around the hedonism of the Avenue," are considered at the bottom of the community's stratification system. Women report their reasons for being on the road are more personal than social. Unlike the road person who is attempting to remove him/herself from society, the runaway is often making an attempt to change a home situation to which he/she can return. Since runaways in Berkeley have few negotiable skills they tend to become street people. The article describes various runaways and the services for them in Berkeley. Miller characterizes running away as "part death fantasy and part puberty ritual" (p. 19).

62
Newcomb, Franklyn. Transient boys. The Family (now Social Case-work), 1933, 14, 57-59.

Newcomb estimates there were a quarter of a million youths under twenty-one years of age on the road during the depression years. In addition to youths who were on the road because of (1) broken homes or the presence of a step parent and (2) the spirit of adventure, two new groups of transient youth were visible in California during the depression era: (1) boys from farming sections of Texas, Oklahoma and the middlewestern states, and (2) the 18-year old unemployed boy who had recently finished high school or had been forced to quit because of financial reasons. The problems created by the lack of employment and services for these youth are mentioned in the article.

63
Nylander, Towne. Wandering youth. Sociology and Social Research, 1932-1933, 17, 560-568.

Nylander of Occidental College identifies four types of boys on the road in the early 1930's: (1) the single boy who has no "definite affiliation" or "distinctive characteristics", (2) "road kids" who travel in gangs of ten to a hundred, (3) the "gay cat" or embryonic tramp or hobo who has been on the road for some time, and (4) "the unfortunate youngster who has come under the control of some pervert" (p. 562). Estimates of the number of wandering boys are given from a variety of sources. Nylander describes the life of these transient boys in three areas--on the road, in the "jungles" (camps where itinerants rest), and in the large cities. Economic (unemployment of both the boy and his parents), social and psychological factors all are reasons for the wandering youths being on the road. Instead of boys' camps as a solution, the author recommends the establishment of a series of permanent farms which would be operated by a group of families to make a livelihood.

64
Outland, George, E. The federal transient service as a deterent of boy transiency. Sociology and Social Research, 1937, 22, 143-148.

In this article Outland at Yale University discusses to what extent boys leave home solely because of the lure of the Federal Transient Service itself. From 3,352 boys (16 to 20 years old) registered at the Los Angeles bureau of the Federal Transient Service in 1934 - 1935 (see Outland, 1938a), 100 or 2.9% gave the desire to experience life in a transient camp as the direct reason for leaving home. Of these, 94 were Mexican boys from two cities--El Paso, Texas, and Phoenix, Arizona. Behind this direct reason, however, it was found that the boys also had economic and social problems with one third of the families represented either being on relief or having the main wage earner unemployed. (See also 65, 66)

65
Outland, George E. Determinants involved in boy transiency. Journal of Educational Sociology, 1938, 11, 360-372. (a)

In this article, Outland at Santa Barbara State College, describes the 3,352 boys who registered at the Los Angeles bureau of the Federal Transient Service from August 1, 1934, to July 31, 1935, on whom verified information was obtained from some social agency. A profile of this group is given according to the following variables: age, duration of transiency, origin of migration, color and nativity, family background, educational background and direct

causes of transiency. The boys included in the study ranged from 16 to 20 years, with 18 being the largest group (27.2%). Most of the boys (69.5%) were on their first trip on the road and most (82%) had been on the road for less than 6 months. The boys came from every state in the union, with 78.7% coming from urban districts. The typical transient was a native white male (88%), who came from a broken home (55.6%) and had completed one or more years of high school (59%). During this period the major cause for transiency was economic (36.3%), followed by social background and problems (26.5%) and a quest for adventure (23.9%). (See also 64, 66)

66
Outland, George, E. The home situation as a direct cause of bov transiency. Journal of Juvenile Research, 1938, 22, 33 - 43. (b)

The home situation as a direct cause of boy transiency is discussed in this article by Outland at Santa Barbara State College in California. Of 3,352 boys (16 to 20 years old) registered at the Los Angeles branch of the Federal Transient Service in 1934-1935 (see Outland, 1938a), 826 or 24.6% of the total group left because of some factor related directly to home life. The number of boys from broken and unbroken homes for each of 21 family reasons is given. Of these 826 boys, 699 or 83.4% were from broken homes. Frequently associated with the home problems stated in these cases were serious economic problems. (See also 64, 65).

67
Paull, Joseph E. The runaway foster child. Child Welfare, 1956, 37, 21-26.

An employee of the child welfare division of the New Mexico Department of Public Welfare in Santa Fe, Paull describes the specific dynamics and reasons why foster children run away. For a non-foster child, running away can frequently be a "positive experience in growing up" in which children "express a developing sense of selfhood and independence" (p. 21). In contrast, the foster child who runs away often does not know where his rebellion is directed and unconsciously uses "one set of persons to act out feelings about other persons." Paull discusses how social case-work can be most effective with the runaway foster child--basically, "the more the child can understand the consequences of his act by engaging the caseworker in small activity directed towards mitigating it, the more real meaning the act will have" (p. 25).

68
Riemer, Morris D. Runaway children. American Journal of Ortho-psychiatry, 1940, 10, 522-528.

Dr. Riemer of the Brooklyn State Hospital in New York describes runaways as antagonistic, surly, defiant, somewhat impulsive, assultive,

disruptive and, at times, over-submissive and docile. A runaway is defined as one who has the above characteristics and "repeatedly runs away from home for periods longer than 24 hours at a time" (p. 522). Two case studies of runaway boys (age 10, age 15) are given. One of the basic reasons for a runaway child is the "lack of parental love of the child, brought about by mismated, mentally ill, or inadequately adjusted parents" (p. 526). Displaying an "extremely negative character", a runaway is driven by the complex of three underlying forces: (1) need for love, (2) need for hostile aggression, and (3) need for increased self-esteem. Riemer concludes that running away - or compulsory running away from reality - "constitutes a severe narcissistic disorder."

69

Robey, Amos, Rosenwald, Richard J., Snell, John E., and Lee, Rita L. The runaway girl: A reaction to family stress. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1964, 34, 762-767.

The authors - three medical doctors and a former probation officer - describe the runaway girls seen at a treatment-oriented court clinic in Framingham, Massachusetts. Of the 293 adolescent girls brought before a Massachusetts Court during a ten year period (1953 - 1963), 162 (55%) were runaways, of which 42 were referred to the Framingham Court Clinic for treatment. The girls in this study ranged from 13 to 17-6 years (mean = 15-3 years) and were living with both parents or one parent and a stepparent. "Those who had not stayed away overnight and those who denied the intent to run away" (p. 763) were excluded from the runaway group. The cause of running away most frequently observed in this study was "the unconscious threat of an incestuous relationship with the father, the fear of the resultant dissolution of the family and the concurrent relationship, inadequate control by the parents over their own and the girls' impulses, deprivation of love of the mother, the subtle pressure by her on the girl to take over the maternal role" (p. 763). (See also 11)

70

Robins, Lee N. Mental illness and the runaway: A 30-year follow-up study. Human Organization, 1958, 16(4), 11-15.

Robins, a Ph.D. research assistant in psychiatry, reports some of the findings of a thirty-year follow-up study of child guidance clinic patients (380 males and 144 females) seen between 1924 and 1929. In this article the adult psychiatric status of male patients who were runaways as children (n = 56) was compared with the adult psychiatric status of male patients with other kinds of childhood behavior problems (n = 123), and with normal male control subjects (n = 46). Of these groups, the runaways had the highest rate of psychiatric illness as adults: 14%--no disease, 32%--sociopathic personality; 16%--psychosis; 11%--neurotic; 7%--alcohol; and 20%--undiagnosed.

When the runaways and non-runaways within each of three groups--delinquent with reformatory, delinquent but no reformatory, and non-delinquent--were compared, it was found that both the runaways as well as the non-runaways in the delinquency and reformatory group had the highest rate of psychiatric illness, especially sociopathic personality. Those diagnosed as sociopathic personalities as adults had the highest rate of prosecution when a youth, while those diagnosed "no disease" had the lowest. Robins concludes that these findings reaffirm his conviction "that different techniques of therapy with delinquents can not be adequately compared without controlling the psychiatric populations they are called upon to treat" (p. 15). Robins points out that it is not known "whether the reformatory experience is a factor in initiating their psychiatric disease or whether the reformatory simply receives a high proportion of the boys with the disease" (p. 15). (See also 71)

71
Robins, Lee N., and O'Neal, Patricia. The adult prognosis for runaway children. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1959, 29, 752-761.

Robins and O'Neal at the Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis, Missouri, report some findings of a thirty year follow-up study of child guidance patients. Of 246 former patients interviewed for the article, 96 (39%) were runaways, of which 70% were males. Running away is defined as the "episode of being away from his place (his parents' home or a foster home) without permission at least overnight before he was 18, whose juvenile police record includes a report of him as missing or of his arrest as a runaway, or whose juvenile court case record describes him as a runaway, whatever the grounds for his arrest" (p. 754). Excluded are those who run away only from a mental hospital or correctional institution. The proportion of runaways in the clinic population increased as the severity of official action increased. Of those never arrested, 5% were runaways; of those arrested but never brought to court, 48%; of those appearing in juvenile court, 73%; and of those sent to a juvenile correctional institution, 81%. Runaways had "an adult arrest rate almost twice that of other clinic patients, an adult incarceration rate that is fourfold that of the other patients, a 50 per cent divorce rate, and a diagnosis of sociopathic personality in almost one third of the cases" (p. 754). Even though running away does not predict adult adjustment when juvenile offense history is controlled, the authors conclude it is an excellent prognostic tool. (See also 70)

72
Rohrbaugh, Lewis. The backgrounds of minor transiency. School and Society, 1963, 43, 583-584.

In this brief article, Rohrbaugh, of the Works Progress Administration in Pennsylvania, presents the reasons for transiency in three samples of boys: (1) 2,007 boys registered at Fort Worth, Texas, during October to December, 1934; (2) 482 boys registered at Philadelphia during September, October and December, 1934; and (3) 150 boys registered at Boys' Bureau, New York City, on December 28, 1935. The age of the boys was not given for any sample. In the Texas and Pennsylvania samples the main reason for leaving was to seek work (75%, 54%). In the New York sample there were three basic causes: broken home (30%), inadequate home relief (30%), and seeking work (26%).

73
Romeo, Anthony. New services approaches to alienated youth. Family Service Highlights, 1969, 30, 95-101+.

This article describes Village Project, a non-sectarian research action program designed in 1968 by the Jewish Family Service for alienated youth or hippies in East Village of New York City. Staffed by an interdisciplinary team and administrated by Romeo, this project focused on helping "the young hippie-runaway-alienated-drug-abusing group" (p. 117) in non-traditional or alternative ways. Four overlapping subgroups of the "hippie population" are identified: (1) plastic or marginal hippies, (2) stone hippies, (3) runaways, and (4) fugitives. Runaways make up two groups--"the runaway who is the law breaker because of his age, and the runaway who does not have the family's permission to be out on his own, even though he has the legal right to leave home" (p. 101). The staff found that even the most alienated youth can be engaged in a therapeutic relationship which maintains Tactual Thematic Therapy goals — that is, "even the most alienated youth has a thematic core which can be touched (emotionally communicated with) and used for healthy growth by employing the widest range of therapeutic modalities available" (p. 117).

74
Rosenheim, F. Techniques of therapy: Runaway adolescent boys. Psychiatric Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1940, 10(4), 651-665.

Psychiatrist Rosenheim states that running away for boys is often caused by the dangerous impulses associated with an unresolved Oedipus complex. To illustrate this type of runaway, three case studies of boys, aged 15-17, are presented. In these cases running away is "self-banishment" and "distinctly unhealthy."

75
Rosenwald, Richard J., and Mayer, Joseph. Runaway girls from suburbia. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1967, 37(2), 402-403.

Rosenwald, with the Framingham Court Clinic in Framingham, Massachusetts, and Mayer, with the Harvard Medical School, examine adolescent girls who have runaway - the single most frequent female delinquent offense. On a variety of measures a group of suburban female runaways showed more signs of disturbance than a group of suburban non-runaways but less disturbance than a group of urban runaways. Runaways are divided into the following four characteristic patterns: (1) the hypermature, (2) the hypomature, (3) the impulse-ridden, and (4) the unclassifiable. The authors conclude that running away is a non-pathognomic symptom which varies in meaning according to the individual girl. Running away is both a premature attempt to achieve independence and an unsuccessful attempt at resolution of a family conflict. "In our society it cannot be a progressive developmental act since it inhibits other important developmental tasks", but "it does have value if it serves as an alert that intrafamily conflicts are leading toward self-destructive behavior" (p. 403).

76
Shellow, Robert, Schamp, Juliana, R., Liebow, Elliot, and Unger, Elizabeth. Suburban runaways of the 1960's. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 1967, 32 (3, Serial No. 111).

This monograph presents the findings of a study on runaways in Prince Georges County, Maryland, from August, 1963, through July, 1964, which was carried out by the Adolescent Process Section of the Mental Health Study Center, a National Institute of Mental Health field station. Seven sources of data were used to study runaways: police missing persons reports (n = 993 completed), reports of follow-up interviews of parents (n = 951), intensive interviews with children (n = 96), school records (n = 562), police records (n = 834), court records (n = 834), and student questionnaire data used for comparative purposes (n = 1327). A runaway is defined as "a child who leaves home voluntarily with the knowledge that he will be missed" (p. 11). Findings regarding runaway episodes (n = 776) were as follows: (1) there is great seasonal variability with a slightly higher incidence in spring, (2) boys' episodes were evenly divided over the week while girls' episodes occurred mostly on weekends, (3) most episodes were impulsive and poorly planned, and (4) almost two-thirds ended within 48 hours.

From the missing persons reports, 631 adolescent runaways (10 to 17 years old; 60% males) were compared according to family characteristics, school experiences and experiences outside the home and school. When compared to a sample of non-runaways, the

runaways were more likely to have been characterized as follows: oldest children (51%); from broken or reconstituted homes (48%); from families who move frequently; from parents with lower occupational ratings; from parents who viewed the family as being in conflict; and high absenteeism, lower letter grades and more years repeated in school. The great majority of all youths (80% non-runaways and 96% runaways) saw themselves as living in family settings marked by conflict. An investigation of 220 runaway repeaters showed they had more serious problems in all parts of their lives. Results of the school questionnaire revealed that there were six self-reported runaways for every one youth reported missing to the police. In summary, this study revealed two analytically separate groups of runaways: (1) a very small minority "for whom running away was ultimately bound up with individual and family pathology" (p. 28), and (2) the majority who looked very much like non-runaways and showed little evidence of severe personal or family disorganization.

77

Shinohara, Mutsuharu, and Jenkins, Richard L. MMPI study of three types of delinquents. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1967, 23, 156-163.

Shinohara and Jenkins, associated with the Child Psychiatry Service at the University of Iowa, report the findings of a study in which they investigated whether three clinically diagnosed groups of delinquents (37 socialized delinquents - SD, 32 unsocialized aggressives - UA, and 27 runaway delinquents - RA) could be differentiated on the basis of Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) scores. According to recorded delinquent behavior and secondarily to observed behavior in the school, records of boys with a sixth grade reading achievement level at the Iowa State Training School for Boys were classified into one of three delinquent groups; only cases where both judges agreed were used (n = 96).

To be classified as a runaway delinquent "repeated running away from home overnight was required" and "stealing in the home, staying out late at night, furtive stealing and passive homosexuality" were regarded as characteristic (p. 157). The ages ranged from 14 to 19 years; the mean age of the runaway group was 17 years. Only 20% of the RA group lived with both natural parents before being committed to the state school as compared with 32% of the UA group and 57% of the SD group. The SD group scored less deviantly than either the UA or RA group on all ten scales of the MMPI. The RA and UA groups could not be separated on the basis of their MMPI scores. The RA boys showed more neurotic tendencies and poorer self-images than the SD boys; in addition, they appeared less masculine and

less paranoid than the UA boys. The authors conclude that the data support the hypothesis that the SD boys exhibit "adaptive goal-oriented motivation behavior" while the UA and RA boys show frustration behavior of two types, fight and flight. (See also 44, 45, 46, 47, 86)

78
Skinner, Mary, and Nutt, Alice S. Adolescents away from home. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1944, 236, 51-59.

Skinner and Nutt, employees of the Children's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor, describe the runaway phenomena during World War II. Even though some youth have left home without permission of their parents and guardians "to seek excitment and high adventure or to escape from unhappiness in home and community", the large majority of runaways during this period were boys (16 - 17 years old) who left home for economic and social reasons to seek work mainly in war-related industries. The number of runaways in America during that time is discussed using a variety of data sources. For example, in 1942 Children's Bureau statistics showed that 478 juvenile courts claimed 8,443 (4,798 boys and 3,645 girls) cases referred for running away. Two main problems in the care of runaways are noted: (1) the lack of public funds to pay for return transportation, and (2) lack of social services to help youth make future plans and to care for youth pending the execution of their plans. Housing, employment and recreational opportunities for migrant youth during the war period are discussed.

79
Staub, H. A runaway from home. Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 1943, 12, 1-22.

In this article Dr. Staub gives a case description which illustrates the use of the psychoanalytic method with a chronic runaway boy. He states that running away represents for boys the romantic urge to become a hero and, for girls, the urge to find a hero. Stengel concludes that "consistent kindness, devoid of sentimental weakness and without a trace of injustice or hostile emotional response, is the appropriate attitude for dealing with adolescents" (pg. 19-20).

80
Stengel, Erwin. Studies on the psychopathology of compulsive wandering. British Journal of Medical Psychology, 1939, 18, 250-254.

Psychiatrist Stengel summarizes the characteristics of individuals who are compulsive wanderers — those who have "an irresistible impulse to leave home and to wander aimlessly."

Based on 22 case studies (17 males and 6 females), Stengel concludes that there is a relationship of the condition of compulsive wandering to cyclic phases of depression and to epilepsy. The one common characteristic he found in all case studies is the occurrence of a "serious disturbance in the child-parent relation, usually of such a nature that relationship to one or both parents was either completely lacking or only partially developed" (p. 251). Stengel points out that the behavior of a runaway child, which is often a symptom of neglected children, is related genetically to the compulsive wandering of an adult. (See also 81)

81
Stengel, Erwin. Further studies on pathological wandering (Fugues with the impulse to wander). Journal of Mental Science, 1943, 89, 224-241.

In this article Dr. Stengel describes "fugues with the impulse to wander" and presents eleven extensive case studies to illustrate the condition. In this study "fugue" refers only to "states of altered or narrowed consciousness with the impulse to wander"; the terms "wander states," "pathological or compulsive wandering," "poriomania" and "wanderlust" refer equally to the same condition. Only one of the case studies is of a person under 18. Stengel points out that many of the cases evidenced serious disturbances in the home and parent-child relations which resulted in an unresolved Oedipus complex for the individual. (See also 80)

82
Stierlin, Helm. A family perspective on adolescent runaways. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1973, 29, 56-62.

In this article Stierlin, an MD and PHD with the Family Studies Section, Adult Psychiatry Branch of the National Institute of Mental Health, discusses modern adolescent runaways and the dynamics of their relationship to their parents. Four types of runaways are identified: (1) abortive, (2) lonely schizoid, (3) crisis, and (4) casual. Of these runaways the abortive and lonely schizoid types are unsuccessful, the casual, successful, and the crisis type, partially successful. Runaway success is defined as the "achievement of geographical distance and/or of premature independence" (p. 57). Stierlin explains the family dynamics of these runaways by looking at transactional modes which "reflect interplay and/or relative dominance of centripetal and centrifugal pushes and pulls between the generations" and "operate as the covert organizing transactional background to the more overt and specific child-parent interactions" (p. 58).

Stierlin hypothesizes that the various runaway types relate to three transactional modes in the following ways: (1) Under the binding mode, the child is locked into a parental orbit from which he does not runaway or makes an abortive attempt to do so. All of these runaways, including the lonely schizoid type, tend to avoid peers. (2) Under the expelling mode, the child is neglected and abandoned by his parents which results in early and casual runaways who adapt well to the runaway culture. (3) Under the delegating mode, a blend of the binding and expelling modes, a child is encouraged by his parents to move out from them up until a point at which they exert control. These youth often run away in a crisis situation and experience conflicts of missions and conflicts of loyalties. Stierlin concludes that treatment of runaway youth must focus on the family and understand the parents' concerns, problems and attitudes. (See also 113, 114, 115)

83
Suddick, David. Runaways: A review of the literature. Juvenile Justice, 1973, 24, 46-54.

In this article Suddick, a Ph.D. affiliated with the Testing and Evaluation Center of the University of Georgia, presents a review of the literature on runaways which is divided into sections on types of runaways, personality of the runaway, the runaway response, treatment, and controlling runaways. With respect to the reasons why youth run away, Suddick points out that some youth run away to escape the environments in which they are victimized, some flee as a result of inner psychic disorders, and "others maliciously tramp for pure spite" (p. 47). From his review of the literature, Suddick states that "with few exceptions, the inescapable conclusion must be drawn--the home environment, in particular the parent-child relationship is the most important factor associated with the flight of the offspring" (p. 48) and that "no uniform set of personality variables can presently be expected to consistently predict bolting" (p. 49). The last sections of the review briefly summarize what others have said about treatment of runaways, especially with respect to where the child should be housed, who should assume responsibility (parent and/or child) for the runaway problem, who should make the initial contact with the runaways, and what should be the role of alternative services (e.g., half-way houses, hot lines, etc.) in helping runaways. (See also 122)

84
Tobias, Jerry L. The affluent suburban male delinquent. Crime and Delinquency, 1970, 16(3), 273-279.

Tobias, an associate professor at the University of Detroit and Director of Juvenile Services for the police department in Bloomfield, Michigan, reports the results of a study conducted

in 1967 in a midwestern community to determine the main types of misconduct--and precipitating causes--of affluent suburban male delinquents. Three formal interview questionnaires and official records were used to compare 100 white male suburban delinquents, 100 white male suburban non-delinquents, and 100 urban delinquents. The affluent suburban male offenses are mostly Class II types of crimes: malicious destruction of property--31%; disorderly conduct--15%; and running away--15%. The causes of delinquency for the suburban males in this study were (1) friends, (2) boredom and restlessness, (3) parents, (4) sudden unexplainable urges, and (5) feeling that the act is the "thing to do". (See also 85)

85
Tobias, Jerry J., and Reynolds, Jay. The affluent suburban runaway. Police Journal, 1970, 43 (10), 335-339.

In this article Tobias and Reynolds present a profile of the 69 official missing person reports filed in 1969 in an affluent suburban community, Bloomfield, Michigan. These reports represented 59 youth (31 males and 28 females) of ages 11 to 17 years, for whom the following was true: (1) the peak age was 15 to 16 years, (2) 20% were not living with their natural parents, (3) 77% were first offenders for running away, (4) over 50% stayed in the local area, (5) 41% returned home within 24 hours, (6) September was the most popular month for leaving, (7) over 50% had been involved in other anti-social activities associated with the present offense or had past or post involvement. Thirty different reasons were given for leaving. Six reasons were given for returning home: police pick-up, encouraged by friend, lack of funds, decided on own to return, party or activity ended, and turned in by other person. (See also 84)

86
Tsubouchi, Kosuke, and Jenkins, Richard L. Three types of delinquents: Their performance on the MMPI and PCR. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1969, 25, 353-358.

Tsubouchi, of the Tokyo Juvenile Detention and Classification Home, and Jenkins, a psychiatrist with the University of Iowa, report the findings of a study which investigated the differences between the responses of three groups of delinquents (group or socialized - SD; unsocialized aggressive - UA; and runaway - RA). Using two instruments - the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) and the Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR). A subsample of 100 boys (43-SD, 24-UA, 33-RA) from the Iowa Training School for Boys was examined in early 1968. No boys from the earlier study by Shinohara and Jenkins (1967) were included. The range of ages was 14 to 19-3 years; the mean age of the runaway group was 16-2 years. Even though all

groups showed similar MMPI profiles, the SD boys were least deviant or more normal. From these and the earlier findings the authors conclude that SD boys are motivated adaptive delinquents while the UA and RA boys are maladaptive frustration delinquents. PCR scores indicated that inadequate mothering was a factor in the development of the UA and RA boys. (See also 44, 45, 46, 47, 77)

87
Wattenberg, William W. Boys who run away from home. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1956, 47, 335-343.

In this article Wattenberg of Wayne University presents findings of an investigation of 575 cases of runaway boys (10 to 17 years old) who were reported as "missing persons" to the Crime Prevention Bureau of the Detroit Police Department. The largest number of boys (169) were 15 years old. Most of the boys (330) lived with both parents. In most cases there was an interaction of several factors which explained why the youth ran away. The main precipitating causes were search for adventure (n = 124), rebellion against parents (n = 115), and escape from school conditions (n = 87). In many cases after the boys returned home, the parents tried to improve relationships with the boys.

88
Weinreb, J., and Counts R. Impulsivity in adolescents and its therapeutic management. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1960, 2, 548-558.

Psychiatrists Weinreb and Counts present two case studies of therapy with runaway youths--a 12-year-old female and a 16-year-old male. Noting that it is difficult to achieve progress in therapy with impulsive, acting-out adolescents, they recommend that the best way to handle them is by early direct interpretation of deep conflictual issues followed by constant strength and help.

89
Wylie, Dorothy C., and Weinreb, Joseph. The treatment of a runaway adolescent girl through treatment of the mother. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1958, 28, 188-195.

The authors, associated with the Worcester Youth Guidance Clinic, present a case study of short-term therapy with a 15-year-old girl. Since the girl's problems was largely due to her mother's guilt feelings, jealousy and non-acceptance of the daughter's growing-up, successful treatment of the girl involved treating the mother as well.

PROFESSIONAL JOURNALS (NON-ENGLISH)

90
Berachyahu, M. B'rihat y'ladim. (Runaway of children from home and educational institutions.) Hahinuh, 1952/53, 25, 438-441.

"Children escape from their homes because of atavistic nomadism drive. Assisting factors are: guilt feelings, feeblemindedness. Escaping increases in the adolescence period. Some educational suggestions are given." (H. Ormian) (Psychological Abstracts, 1955, 29, No. 585.)

91
Berger, I., and Schmidt, R. M. Kinderpsychiatrische und psychologische Untersuchungsergebnisse bei Spontan- und Reaktivfortlaeufern. (Results of child psychiatric and psychological investigations of spontaneous and reactive runaways.) Prax. Kinderpsychol. Kinderpsychiat., 1958, 7, 206-210.

"10 boys and 2 girls ranging in age between 8-5 and 14-6 years, who were 'spontaneous' runaways, and 20 boys and 4 girls between 7-10 and 14-7 years, who were 'reactive' runaways, were studied. The personality dynamics of the conflicts causing the running away varied between the 2 groups: spontaneous runaways had an inherent urge for change of environment, for flight, and for motor activity; in reactive runaways the conflict inherent in the family situation, the child's rejection of the parents and his need to be considered an adult, as well as his rejection of the school situation, figured prominently in the personality picture." (E. Schwerin) (Psychological Abstracts, 1959, 33, No. 10482.)

92
Bergeron, M. Fugues et vagabondages juveniles. (Juvenile running away and vagrancy.) Bull. G. Etud. Psychol., Univ. Paris, 1952, 6, 309-310.

"A distinction is made between the runaway and the vagrant. It has been proven that juvenile runaways and vagrants are at the same time the most abandoned and the most curable of misadapted youth. Therefore it is necessary to help and guide them in order to make their social readaptation possible. Public opinion must be

alerted so that public agencies, enlightened on this eminently human and social problem, can take the necessary steps." (D. Bélanger) (Psychological Abstracts, 1954, 28, No. 1279.)

93
Regel, H., and Parnitzke, K. H. Entstehungsbedingungen des Fortlaufens bei Kindern. (Causative conditions of running-away in children.) Psychiatrie, Neurologie und medizinische Psychologie, 1967, 19 (8), 281-290.

"Social, psychic, and somatic causes are reported for 75 7-15 yr. old run-away Ss. Social factors include disturbed parent-child relations, conflicts at school and frequent changes of residence. Personality characteristics are multiform and mixed, so a typological structure is not readily determined. Most of the runaways were diagnosed as having suffered some brain damage during early childhood." (K. J. Hartman) (Psychological Abstracts, 1968, 42, No. 2722.)

94
Rennert, H. Das Fortlaufen der Kinder und die Poriomanie. Eine diagnostiche Betrachtung. (The running away of children and poriomania: a diagnostic consideration.) Psychiat. Neurol. med. Psychol., Leipzig, 1954, 6, 139-151.

"With clinical examples, the 'psychologically understandable forms' of running away in children and adolescents are differentiated. These syndromes are separated from poriomania on psychopathic or neuropathic basis. The relationship to the epileptoid forms and various aspects of the differential diagnosis are considered." (C. T. Bever) (Psychological Abstracts, 1955, 29, No. 2704.)

95
Schliebe, G. Selbstberichte jugendlicher Ausreisser. (Young runaways' own reports of themselves.) Z. Jugendk., 1934, 4, 275-280.

"The majority of runaways are healthy normal youths motivated by the romantic longings of adolescense stimulated by reading and movies, or by the need to free themselves from a conflict situation arising in the family or

school environment. The quoted account by three boys of their attempt to run away to America and get into the movies illustrates the first type; and that of a girl who had failed to get marks necessary to obtain financial aid in school and so ran away to work and earn money illustrates the second motive." (M. Lee) (Psychological Abstracts, 1935, 9, No. 2535.)

96
Straube, W. Zur Psychopathologie jugendlicher weiblicher Fortlaeufer. (The psychopathology of young female runaways.) Prax. Kinderpsychol. Kinderpsychiat., 1957, 6, 167-170.

"3 cases of 12- to 16-year-old girls who are compulsive runaways are reported. In all 3 cases the first episode of running away occurred after onset of the menarche, and whenever menstruation thereafter did not occur. No external precipitating causes for running away could be ascertained, but all 3 girls had previously experienced brief periods of 'autochthonous' disturbances. A close relationship between biological changes at the time menstruation is due and of 'autochthonous' disturbances seems to exist. Endrocrine psychoses or brain injuries were ruled out in all 3 cases." (E. Schwerin) (Psychological Abstracts, 1959, 33, No. 1716.)

97
Straube, W., and Fuhrmann, W. Ueber EEG-Befunde bei verhaltensgestoerten Kindern, unter besonderer Beruecksichtigung der Fugue. (On EEG findings in children with abnormal behavior, with special considerations of fugues.) Nervenarzt, 1958, 29, 209-213.

"The authors examined 61 patients, age 8-16, who had a history of running away from home. They used clinical observation, EEG and a battery of psychological tests. They classified 16 as 'neurotic,' 18 as 'dysphoric-emotionally unstable,' the rest comprised 'motoric retardation,' 'asthenics,' 'hyperthymics,' and 'sociopaths,' Only 2 'pathological EEGs' were found in the neurotic, sociopathic, and asthenic groups, whereas, a high percentage of abnormal EEGs were found in the other groups which

suggest the possibility of somatic causation of the psychic abnormality, but there was no case of epilepsy or any other recognizable brain-disease. The Rorschach tests were the only ones yielding results that could be correlated positively with the abnormal EEG." (M. Kaelbling) (Psychological Abstracts, 1959, 33, No. 8894.)

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS, MISCELLANEOUS REPORTS AND PAPERS

98
Beyer, Margaret, Holt, Susan, A., Reid, Thomas A., and Quinlan, Donald M. Runaway Youths: Families in Conflict. Paper presented at the meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., May 4, 1973.

The authors--Beyer and Quinlan of Yale University, and Holt and Reid of the Hamden Mental Health Service (HMHS)--present the findings of a study of 13 runaways and 15 parents in 16 families seen at the HMHS, a child and family counseling agency in Southern Connecticut. In this study the runaway was defined as a youth reported by parents as a missing child to the police or the HMHS. The ages of the youth ranged from 12 to 18 years with a median age of 15 years. There were nine females and six males. Examination of parent and youth interviews and questionnaries revealed that parents and youth agreed on the importance of the following issues in causing conflict: hours of returning home, number of nights allowed out, parental remarriage, attendance at and grades in school. Ten of the families (63%) had experienced parental death, separation or divorce. The authors conclude that "there is a strong suggestion that running away is one of the symptoms of unstable and conflict-laden family situations" (p.8). For many youth the runaway act was impulsive and unplanned, following a phase of depression. Youth's objectives in running away can be classified into three categories: (1) escaping, (2) experiencing excitement and independence, and (3) producing change at home. (See also 120)

99
Brennan, Tim, Blanchard, Fletcher, Huizinga, Dave, and Elliott, Delbert. Final Report: The Incidence and Nature of Runaway Behavior. (Report prepared for the Office of Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.) Boulder, Colorado: Behavioral Research and Evaluation Corporation, 1975.

This report presents the findings of a pilot study conducted by a group of researchers in Boulder to determine the feasibility of estimating the incidence of running away from home. The probability sample of households screened for the existence of runaway youth, ages 10 -17,

included 640 households in a northeastern section of Colorado and 2,000 households in the Denver SMSA. The definitions of a runaway youth used in the analyses included four basic components: gone from home without parents' permission or consent, stated intent to run away, length of time gone, and parent or youth report. Based on the parent report sample only, 2.06% of the youth population (4.24% of households with youth, ages 10-17) had run away from home during the previous twelve months. When this estimate is corrected for parents who did not acknowledge a runaway youth in the household, 3.63% of the youth population (7.13% of youth households) had run away within the previous year. Furthermore, 1.76% of all youth (3.76% of youth households) had run away in the previous year for episodes of 24 hours or longer.

A hierarchical cluster analysis applied to the behavioral data only from the runaway episodes of 165 runaways (26 from the probability sample and 139 from the purposive sample) resulted in a five-part classification system for runaway episodes. The five types are as follows: Type 1 - Spontaneous unplanned episodes, Type 2 - Deliberate successful episodes, Type 3 - Temporary "good time" episodes, Type 4 - Difficult long term escapist episodes, and Type 5 - Temporary escapist episodes.

Finally, a social-psychological or etiological typology of runaway types was delineated for the 165 runaways using multivariate methods applied to 37 different explanatory variables in four domains (family, school, peers, personal). These sever types are as follows:

A. Lower delinquency runaways:

Type 1 - Young runaways from stressful families.
Type 2 - Middle class "loners:" A "running to" model.
Type 3 - Autonomous "older" runaways.

B. Delinquent runaways:

Type 4 - Lower social class, high family and school stresses: high delinquency and commitment to delinquent peers.

Type 5 - Delinquent girls with highly stressful home and school situations and strong peer pressure toward delinquency.

Type 6 - High social class, delinquent youth: Stressful, rejecting family, low school involvement, and high commitment to delinquent peers.

Type 7 - Young males with highly stressful home and school situations and high commitment to delinquent peers.

Finally, with respect to recommendations regarding the feasibility of a national study, authors suggest "that a national propability sample be used solely for the purpose of estimating the incidence of runaway and that it not be used to collect detailed information about runaway episodes, runaways and their families. This latter would be more successfully accomplished by conducting several smaller studies in several carefully chosen localities" (p.211). (See also 100)

100
Brennan, Tim, Brewington, Susan, and Walker, Lynn. A Study of Issues Relating to Runaway Behavior. (Report prepared for the Office of Youth Development, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.) Boulder, Colorado: Behavioral Research and Evaluation Corporation, 1974.

Part I of this report submitted to the Office of Youth Development includes a review of some of the social, psychological and correctional literature regarding the problem of runaway youth in addition to a partial annotated bibliography of runaway sources. Part II presents the findings regarding runaway youth and their characteristics from the analyses of four different data sets: two sets of data collected by BREC for the national evaluation of the Youth Service Systems, data collected by BREC for a study of drug use in the Denver area, and information from a runaway shelter, the Freeway Station in Lincoln, Nebraska.

A sophisticated typological analysis, based on Ward's hierarchical grouping methods, of a sample of 132 self-reported runaways and about 400 non-runaways in Denver in 1973 revealed the following runaway types: (1) minority males(A): violent delinquents, multiple runaway demographic variables; (2) middle class females: not alienated, good self-concept, occasional runaway; (3) minority males (B): extreme negative

labeling and denial of access, highly delinquent, multiple runaway; (4) one-time runaways: similar in many ways to non-delinquents, but of low self-concept and alienated; (5) lower status(females): high levels of alienation, negative labeling, denial of access, delinquency. Each type of runaway and non-runaways were subsequently analyzed according to the following variables: broken homes, parents working or unemployed, relationships to adults and parents, church-going behavior, ethnicity, age, sex, social needs and problems of youth. In further validation of the typology, stepwise discriminant analyses were performed (1) to clarify the separation of types, and (2) to indicate the relative power of the classificatory variables. The prediction of three levels of runaway behavior--never, one-time, and repeater--is presented in a further section of the report. These analyses showed that (1) the more delinquent a youth is, the more he/she tends to run away, (2) estrangement from the educational institutions differentiates between runaways and non-runaways, and (3) the parental rejection scale is the most powerful discriminator. (See also 99)

101
Butler, Dodie, Riener, Joe, and Treanor, Bill. Runaway House: A Youth-run Service Project. (Prepared for the Center for Studies of Child and Family Mental Health, Division of Special Mental Health Programs, National Institute of Mental Health). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

This booklet describes SAJA, Special Approaches in Juvenile Assistance, a "counter-culture collective" incorporated in November, 1969, in Washington, D. C., and its many established projects -- Runaway House, group foster homes, a free job finding co-op, summer employment program for neighborhood youth, and a free high school. Runaway House is a temporary shelter and counseling program for youth under 18 who have run from home, reform school, mental hospitals, and other places. The philosophy behind Runaway House is that youth can make their own decisions about the future if they have a supportive atmosphere and appropriate advice. Since June of 1968 when Runaway House opened in the Dupont Circle neighborhood of Washington, D. C., over 3000 runaways between ages 10 and 17 have stayed there. The youth have come from every social class, religion, and section of the country. About 60% alone come from the Washington metropolitan area. In addition to a detailed description of how Runaway House began, how it evolved, and how it operates today, provisions for youth who stay at Runaway House and a lengthy list of tips for operating a runaway house are provided. (See also 31, 108)

102
Canadian Council on Social Development (formerly Canadian Welfare Council). More about Transient Youth. (Report of a National Consultation on Transient Youth, convened by the Canadian Welfare Council as a follow-up to the Transient Youth Inquiry, March 30-April 2, 1970, Ste. Adele, Quebec.) Ottawa: Canadian Welfare Council, 1970.(a)

This report describes the highlights of a consultation meeting held to discuss the 26 recommendations of the "Transient Youth Inquiry," a report based on study of transient youth in the summer of 1969 (see 103). Participants at the meeting included 26 youth and 43 representatives of local and national organizations from Canadian provinces and cities. Although the main focus of the discussion was on transient youth, the needs of runaway youth were recognized as most urgent. The consultation participants gave highest priority to two recommendations: (1) establishing a network of hostels and (2) establishing youth operated drop-in centers. (See also 103, 104, 105)

103
Canadian Council on Social Development (formerly Canadian Welfare Council). Transient Youth: Report of an Inquiry in the Summer of 1969. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Social Development, 1970.(b).

This report was prepared between mid-June and mid-September, 1969, "to provide a profile of youth who are itinerants and to describe and assess the patterns of community response to the phenomenon of transient youth (p.20)" in various Canadian provinces. Results of interviews with 24 youth in each of 5 cities (Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal) are reported. Common problems in providing services to transient youth are discussed under the following headings: secure support, runaway children, availability of drugs, role of police, reentry to society, and goals of social institutions involved. Very little about the runaway youth sub-population is specified. It is reported that in 1967 there were 33,412 juveniles reported missing in Canada of which 98.6% were found. (See also 102, 104, 105)

104
Canadian Council on Social Development. Transient Youth 70-71. Report of an Inquiry about Programs in 1970, and Plans for 1971. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Social Development, 1971. (a)

This report describes the hostel activities and provisions (with and without armouries) in Canadian cities in the summer of 1970 and discusses Canadian plans for transient youth in 1971. The inquiry into hostel programs available in 1970 was concluded under the guidance of the National Hostel Task Force which evolved out of the consultation meeting on the Transient youth Inquiry held in the spring of 1970. The 1971 plans for transient youth include discussions of national roles and resources, roles of the provinces, local responsibilities, guidelines for operation of hostels, hostel financing, and youth objectives. No specific mention of runaway youth is made in the report. (See also 102, 103, 105)

105
Canadian Council on Social Development. Youth '71: An Inquiry into the Transient youth and Opportunities for Youth Programs in the Summer of 1971. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Social Development, 1971. (b)

Results of a transient youth survey taken at 44 youth hostels in 18 Canadian cities and towns in July and August, 1971, are presented in this report. In the survey 237 (175 males, 62 female) transient youth, ages 14-25 years (8.4% under 17 years; 29.5% under 18 years), were interviewed about their experiences and problems while travelling. Of those interviewed, 60.8% said they would have travelled even if work had been available, 39.3% were travelling alone, and 84.5% hitchhiked. The problems of runaways, who represent a small portion of the transient youth population, are mentioned in the report. (See also 102, 103, 104)

106
Focus Project helps runaways understand their problems. Youth Reporter, December 1973.

This article describes a runaway house in Las Vegas, Nevada, which is funded by Office of Youth

Development, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This youth project, directed by Ray ben David, helps youth confront and resolve their problems by involving them in encounter therapy and participating in "games". The adults do not live in the shelter but are available for counsel on a 24 hour basis. The major house rules are (1) parents must be contacted within 24 hours if the youth stays, and (2) no drugs are allowed. This shelter, which can house 15 youths at once, in 1973 served 803 youths (ages 12 to 17 years) of which 302 were from outside the Las Vegas area. Of those served, 672 returned home and 99 were placed in alternative settings.

107
Gold, Martin, and Reimer, David J. Testimony presented on the "Runaway Youth Act" to the Subcommittee on Equal Opportunity of the United States House Committee on Education and Labor, May 2, 1974.

In their testimony before the House Committee, social scientists Gold & Reimer present the results of the National Survey of Youth in 1972. Conducted by the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research, this survey sampled 1,395 youths (ages 11 to 18 years) who were chosen to represent the 48 contiguous states from May through July of 1972. Results of the 90 minute personal interviews with each youth revealed that 6% of the sample had run away from home within a three year period from May 1969 to July 1972. Based on this sample percentage, Gold & Reimer estimate that there were 1,475,000 to 2,369,000 runaways in the United States during the same three year period or about 500,000 to 750,000 runaways each year. Seventy percent of the runaways in the study stayed close to home at the home of a relative or close friend. The study also describes the runaways according to other variables, such as contact with police on the run, involvement with other "delinquent" or socially non-accepted behaviors, socioeconomic background, age, places where run to, and how long gone on run. The authors point out that official data on runaways, such as police records, are inaccurate and therefore inadequate for public policy formulation. According to the 1972 survey and a similar 1967 survey, the proportion of youths running away has remained the same; the absolute number was larger in 1972 since there was a larger youth population then.

108
Gordon, James S. Working with Runaways and Their Families: How the SAJA Community Does It. Unpublished manuscript. Washington, D. C.: Center for Studies of Child and Family Mental Health, National Institute of Mental Health, 1974.

Gordon, a research psychiatrist with the Center for Studies of Child and Family Mental Health, National Institute of Mental Health, presents "an account of the development, philosophy and delivery of a particular kind of human service: counselling with runaways and their families based in a runaway house"(p. 1). Runaway House in the Dupont Circle area of Washington, D. C. is one part of a community of social service projects, called Special Approaches in Juvenile Assistance (SAJA). In January, 1972, Gordon helped start a non-hierarchiacally structured family seminar (1) to meet needs of runaways and their families, (2) to help SAJA staff further counselling skills, and (3) to provide a support place so that those interested in counselling could learn from each other. As the family seminars evolved, "counsellors, as well as parents and children, had to come to see the act of running away as an intelligible event in the life of the whole family, not an objectified and isolated happening, a crime or a catastrophe or an aberration"(p.12). Of the 124 families seen by the seminar during a two year period, four case studies are presented to illuminate the scope and variety of the seminar's activities. Gordon notes that "the more we get to know the young people, the clearer it becomes that the physical act of running away is often only the outward and visible manifestation of an inner withdrawal that has long been underway" (p. 31). (See also 31, 101)

109
Institute for Scientific Analysis. The Sick, the Bad, and the Free: A Review of the Runaway Literature. (Paper prepared for the Social and Rehabilitative Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.) San Francisco; Scientific Analysis Corporation, 1974.

This review of the literature presents "a broader understanding of the youth runaway phenomenon by addressing the vocabulary of motives attributed to the act and

the social intervention strategies so derived" (p. 1) for three perceptions of a runaway - sick, bad, free. The largest amount of literature on runaways describes the runaway youth as "sick" and focuses upon predispositional and casual factors underlying the runaway act. Research in this category is mostly psychiatric or psychological and concentrates on motives arising out of individual pathology, family pathology, or both.

The second largest body of literature describes the runaway as "bad", criminally deviant, delinquent or sociopathic. Research within this delinquent or sociopathic model is mostly done by psychologists, criminologists or sociologists on samples of incarcerated or 'adjudicated' delinquents. The medical model of treatment or rehabilitation which views the individual as needing adjustment or resocialization is stressed in the literature which presents runaways as "sick" and/or "bad". From both perspectives, the treatment of runaways recommended is usually individual, group or family counseling. Finally, there is little literature which perceives runaways as "free" youth who are motivated by socio-cultural forces to express their independence and self-determination. Many of these youth live independently of their parents under newly assumed identities until they reach the age of majority.

110
National Youth Alternatives Project. National Directory of Runaway Centers. Washington: National Youth Alternatives Project, 1974.

This booklet prepared by the National Youth Alternatives Project gives an overview of all runaway centers in the United States at the date of publication. A runaway center is a place that accepts runaway youths on a voluntary self-referral basis in order to provide them with short term housing in group homes or in other residential facilities in the community. Operating on the assumption that runaways want to work on their problems, runaway centers provide youths with counseling and referral services to help them decide about their futures. The directory gives descriptions of 41 residential and 18 non-residential counseling services in the United States. In an introductory overview section various characteristics of the programs (including housing, food, counseling, post-residential counseling,

post residential counseling, out-of-home placements, non-residential counseling and services, medical services and legal services), staffing and administration patterns, and funding issues relating to runaway centers are presented. In addition, one section summarizes characteristics of runaways, their parents and runaway center staff. The questionnaire used by the survey is included at the booklet's end.

111
Reinholz, Mary. The throwaway children. Youth Reporter, December, 1973. (Reprinted from the New York Times Magazine).

Reinholz describes the plight of Manhattan's East Village "ragtag kids" who often call themselves "throwaways"-- "throwaways, disposable children tossed out with the trash"(p. 7). Many of these children, who are mostly unskilled and semi-literate, grew up in reform and mental institutions or in families and foster homes where they were beaten and neglected. The author claims that this type of runaway child began to dominate the streets of the East Village about the time that "flower power" faded and most middle-class runaway youth left. The major problems faced by the females are rape and housing, while those of the males included beatings, run-ins with ripoff artists, and homosexual assault.

112
Saltonstall, Margaret B. Runaways and Street Children in Massachusetts. Boston: Massachusetts Committee on Children and Youth, 1973.

This study by the Massachusetts Committee on Children and Youth describes the runaway phenomenon in the commonwealth of Massachusetts during July, 1972. A runaway is defined as "a child under eighteen years of age who is absent from home for 24 hours or more without parental permission" (p. 4). In addition, runaways from foster or group homes and other institutions are included in the report. Data collected from 117 private and public Massachusetts units revealed that in 84 communities there were 428 reported runaways, of which 302 (70.6%) were females. The largest number of runaways, 225 (52.6%), were ages 13 to 15 years. Only 50 (11.7%)

came from outside Massachusetts, while almost one-half of the total population for July, 1972, remained in or close to their own community. Of these runaways, 41.5% lived with both natural parents, 25% with a single parent, and 15% with neither natural parent.

A family argument was the largest (55.6%) precipitating reason given for running away; seven percent were institutional runaways. Of those runaways gone for one month or more (40 females and 23 males) 30.2% needed a foster home and 33.4%, individual or family counseling. The Massachusetts resources available in 1973 to runaways and street people - hot lines, emergency shelter services, service centers, and medical services - are briefly described. In addition, three community models of services to runaway youth are described: (1) urban model - Boston, (2) suburban model - Arlington; and (3) rural model - Martha's Vineyard. Recommendations for future actions include the following: (1) deal with runaways outside the courts, and (2) provide more small group homes for youths.

113
Stierlin, Helm. Characteristics of Suburban Adolescent Runaways. Paper in the United States Senate, Hearings on Runaway Youth before the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary. 92nd Congress, 1st session. pp. 171-181. January 13-14, 1972.

The aim of the study described in this article was to delineate a clinical typology of runaways that links individual characteristics to peer and family relationships. The typology derived has four categories: uncontrollable "ne'er-do-wells", crisis runaways, sweet "bad" girls, and lonely schizoid runaways. The author, a PhD-MD in the family studies section of the adult psychiatry branch of the National Institute of Mental Health, defines a runaway as "an adolescent who, before reaching age 17, has absented himself from his parents' home without permission for at least one full night"(p.172). From the "underachievers" study sample of 36 families (each with one 14- to 16- year-old "underachiever") who over a five year period had participated in family therapy through the adult psychiatry branch of NIMH, thirty runaway

children (21 index "underachievers" and nine siblings) were identified. The twenty-one "underachievers" had more symptomatology of a delinquent nature (such as truancy, assaultive behavior, stealing, and drug/alcohol abuse) than the fifteen non-runaway "unachievers", while the non-runaways had more symptons of a psychotic or neurotic nature (such as depression, withdrawal, hyperactivity, thought disorder, neurotic and psychosomatic symptons). (See also 82, 114, 115)

114
Stierlin, Helm. On the Therapy of Adolescent Runaways. Paper presented at the combined meetings of the American Society of Adolescence and Psychiatry, and the American Psychiatric Association, Detroit, Michigan, May 6 - 10, 1974.

In this paper Stierlin, acting chief of the Family Studies Section, Adult Psychiatry Branch of the National Institute of Mental Health, outlines therapy and treatment strategies for various types of runaway youth and their parents. Three types of family situations are hypothesized: (1) Families with predominantly binding forces have prevailing centripetal forces and tend to produce abortive and lonely schizoid runaways; (2) Families with predominantly expelling forces have prevailing centrifugal forces, have neglectful and rejectful parents, and tend to foster casual runaways; (3) Families with a blend of binding and expelling factors exhibit a mixture of centrifugal and centripetal forces and treat the adolescent as a delegate of the parents which often results in crisis runaways.

Stierlin suggests which treatment strategies are best for the various runaways and their families. For example, in the case of a delegated runaway, control and resolution of the parents' shame and guilt is a high priority for therapy. In the case of the casual runaway, family therapy has no chance; instead the creation of an instant shelter that has opportunities for the development of caring, non-exploitative relationships is recommended. Some general perspectives necessary for the treatment of all runaways include the need for multigenerational fairness and empathy, and the importance of a "third party" mediator. (See also 82, 113, 115)

115
Stierlin, Helm, Levi, L. David, and Savard, Robert J. Centrifugal Versus Centripetal Separation in Adolescence: Two Patterns and Some of Their Implications. Paper in United States Senate, Hearings on Runaway Youth before the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary. 92nd Congress, 1st Session. Pp. 193-210. January 13-14, 1972.

Based on their experiences in therapy with thirteen families seen at the Families Study Section of the Adult Psychiatry Branch of the National Institute of Mental Health, the authors describe two extreme modes of adolescent separation from the family of origin -- centripetal and centrifugal. In adolescence "oedipal conflicts" are reactivated and finally resolved. In centripetal separation, there is a delayed separation of the youth from the family since the family and parental ties dominate over those of outsiders. In contrast, in centrifugal separation, the youth rushes to separation from the family since his/her only sources of satisfaction come from outside the uncohesive family. The centrifugal youths exhibit thrill or adventure - seeking behaviors, motoric expansiveness, a capacity to relate easily to peers, and an ability to find sex partners easily. Case studies of families showing each configuration are given. Both extreme patterns of separation can lead either to schizophrenic or to sociopathic developments. (See also 82, 113, 114)

116
United States Senate, United States Congress. Runaway Youth. Hearings before the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary. 92nd Congress, 1st session. Legislative hearings on S. 2829, the "Runaway Youth Act." January 13-14, 1972.

These Senate hearings on the "Runaway Youth Act" (S.2829) present a variety of viewpoints towards runaways and what policies are appropriate regarding them. Among those testifying were runaways themselves, directors of runaways facilities in several cities (Bridge in San Diego, Huckleberry House in San Francisco, and Runaway House in Washington), court and police representatives, federal government representatives from the Department

of Health, Education and Welfare, and the executive director of Traveler's Aid Society. Also included with the testimony are a report on the Bridge, a home for runaways in San Diego, and letters from parents of runaways. (The Appendix includes the following articles: 30, 76, 113, 115)

117
United States Senate, United States Congress. The Runaway Youth Act Report (Accompanies S. 645) Together With Additional Views. Report #93-191 (Calender No. 181). 93rd Congress, 1st Session. June 4, 1974.

This report and additional views discuss the "Runaway Youth Act" (S. 645) which was originally introduced by Senators Bayh and Cook in the previous congressional session as S. 2829. Runaways are defined as "juveniles who have left homes without the specific permission of their parents or guardians." The purposes of the proposed runaway act are (1) to strengthen interstate reporting and services to parents, (2) to conduct research on the size of the runaway population, and (3) to establish, maintain and operate temporary housing and counseling services for runaway youth. The purposes of the shelters to be funded are (1) to divert youth from the traditional juvenile justice system and (2) to prevent juvenile delinquency. For these services, the bill authorizes appropriateness of $10 million for each of three years. The report states that there are approximately one million runaway youth each year, of which the average runaway is a fifteen year old, white, middle class female. The report includes summary of the legislative hearings in January, 1972, about the "Runaway Youth Act". The report concludes with Senator Hruska's remarks concerning his opposition to the proposed act. Basically, he feels that there is no clearly established need for the services of the act and doubts the effectiveness of runaway shelters to deter juvenile delinquency.

DISSERTATIONS

118
Bartollas, Clemens L. Runaways at the Training Institution, Central Ohio. (Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34, 2789A. (University Microfilms No. 73-26,769)

"The purpose of this study was to examine the problem of the runaway student at the Training Institution, Central Ohio. Investigation of institutional records revealed 145 successful runaway events involving 125 different boys in the period January 1970 through October 1972. In addition to the successful escapes, there were 39 other students who attempted to escape during the same period....In this study, there were eleven variables which statistically differentiated runaways from non-runaways. Runaways were predominantly white, had a previous history of drugs and alcohol abuse in the community, were not assigned 'R' and 'E' suffixes at the intake center, had a runaway pattern at previous Ohio Youth Commission facilities, had spent more time at other OYC institutions, had been given fewer home visits at TICO, had more incidents of homosexual behavior at TICO, had completed less years in school at TICO, had poorer grades in school at TICO, and had more 'unsatisfactory' completion of parole following TICO.

The Jesness Inventory which was used to differentiate personality differences between runaways and non-runaways failed to identify any significant personality characteristics unique to runaways...The central thesis of the dissertation was that a boy becomes a runaway when he is faced with an unmanageable problem which he feels is unshareable. The interviews with 40 students, 20 runaways and 20 comparison boys, revealed that this thesis could be documented with nearly every subject. In addition, the interviews indicated that there were four types of runaways: white students who ran on impulse, black students who ran on impulse, white students who planned their escape, and black students who planned their escape...Another major finding was that neither personality nor institutional variables alone were as decisive in escapes as the interaction between them."

119
Bassis, Edward M. Characteristics of adolescent runaways in a community residential treatment center. (Doctoral Dissertation, United States International University, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33, 5505-5506B. (University Microfilms No. 73-11,433)

"The problem of this study was to determine the characteristics of adolescents who are runaways and to investigate and describe these characteristics along dimensions such as age, sex, family makeup, drug use patterns, personality characteristics, social adjustment, personal adjustment, values, and purpose in life." The data was collected from a drug use questionnaire and four standardized instruments--Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, California Test of Personality, Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values, and Purpose in Life Test. The sample studied included 40 runaways and a matched control group (n = 23) who had never run away from home. There was a significant difference between runaways and controls on 20 out of 26 scales of four instruments, and between runaway drug abusers and runaway drug users on only 5 scales. From the results Bassis concluded that (1) runaways' personality and social characteristics as a group differed from non-runaways, (2) runaways' test profiles were similar to those of juvenile delinquents, (3) runaways showed more drug use than non-runaways, and (4) counseling that involves a short term separation of youth from their family and includes the family in the counseling process can be effective in helping runaways and their families with problems.

120
Beyer, Margaret. The psychosocial problems of adolescent runaways. (Doctoral Dissertation, Yale University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35, 2420-2421B. (University Microfilms No. 74-25, 718).

In this study 32 adolescents, 14 males and 18 females who had runaway from home, were compared to their 18 male and 14 female non-runaway natural siblings. The sample was located through police missing person records in a suburban town and mental health outpatient records in a larger metropolitan area. In general, the runaways had

not prepared for running away. The median number of nights away from home was four; 41% of the youth spent all of their time away in the town where they lived. Measures administered to the adolescent pairs were the following: Beck Depression Inventory, Coopersmith Self-esteem Inventory, Life Events Scale, Jackson Impulsivity Scale, Matching Familiar Figures Test, Parent Behavior Inventory, Dot Completion, Duration Inventory, Time Estimation and Production, Interview, and WISC Information Subtest.

The adolescent runaways in the study were significantly different than their siblings on a number of dimensions: "(a) the runaways were more depressed, had lower self-esteem (especially on home and school dimensions) and reported more life events, which had been linked to adult depression and psychiatric hospitalization; (b) while more impulsive on a self-report measure, the runaways were as reflective as their siblings on psychomotor tasks; and (c) the runaways' relationships with both parents were more conflicted, and they felt more rejection and hostile control from parents--particularly fathers." In addition, runaway youth tend to be scapegoated, to have greater dissatisfaction with their school work, and to experience greater conflict in homes with a mother and stepfather than in other families. The study suggests that it is the interaction and combination of interpersonal, family and school factors which precipitate a youth's running away from home. (See also 98)

121
English, Clifford J. On the streets: A participant observational study of an adolescent subculture. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33, 5965A. (University Microfilms No. 73-11,098)

"In certain geographical areas, the numbers of runaways congregating has reached such proportions that they comprise what the researcher has termed 'an adolescent street subculture.' This study concentrates on adolescents between the ages of 12 and 17 who have adopted this particular life style. Data was collected

primarily through participant observation, supplemented with extensive interviews....Observations were carried out over a year's period of time, in which the researcher explored the content of the subculture, concentrating on the shared value system among participants, commonly held goals and attitudes toward the 'straight world.' It is hypothesized that their illegal status combined with similar attitudes and values forms the basis of the subculture....While the primary purpose of the study is exploratory, it also is an attempt to clarify the runaway problem, particularly in terms of how participants define it. Thus, a classification system of runaways is presented which demonstrates that there are different types of runaways. An analysis is presented of an alternative institution which attempted to cope with the problems these adolescents encountered." (See also 26)

122
Suddick, David E. Female juvenile runaways from home. (Doctoral Dissertation, Colorado State College, 1969). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 30, 4161-4162A. (University Microfilms No. 70-7170)

The purpose of this study was to investiagte the characteristics of female juvenile runaways from cases heard by the Juvenile Court of the City and County of Denver, Colorado, in 1966, 1967, and 1968. The results of regression analyses using five basic variables--age, cultural group, school-work, number of past referrals to court, and family income-revealed that there were no differences between runaways and non-runaways for any of the three years and showed some differences between the runaways from year to year. The number of past referrals differentiated between the 1966 and 1967 female runaways and between the 1967 and 1968 female runaways, while the number of past referrals and school-work differentiated between the 1966 and 1968 runaways. From the findings of this study, "it is recommended that runaways be considered from two viewpoints: first, group characteristics and secondly, perceptions of runaways." (See also 83)

POPULAR MAGAZINES*

123
Brooks, P. They can go home again. McCalls, January 1972, p.57.

124
Gentle Marcie: A shattering tale of a runaway to hippie-land. Newsweek, October 30, 1967, p.88.

125
Larsen, R. Runaways. PTA Magazine, November 1972, pp.26-32.

126
Margetts, S., & Feinburg, M. R. Why do executives' children run away? Duns Review, January 1968, p.40.

127
Peters, W. Riddle of teenage runaways. Good Housekeeping, June 1968, p.88.

128
Remsberg, C., & Remsberg, B. How teen runaways get help: Huckleberry House San Francisco. Seventeen, January 1972, pp.122-123.

129
Riley, D. Runaways and then there were thousands... Washingtonian Magazine, November 1971, pp.1-6.

130
Runaway children. U.S.News and World Report, April 24, 1972, pp.38-42.

131
Runaway kid. Life, November 3, 1967, p.18.

132
Runaways: A million bad trips. How youth agencies try to help. Newsweek, October 26, 1970, pp.67-68.

133
Runaways--a national problem. Time, August 27, 1973, p.57.

134
Runaways: Rising US worry. U.S. News and World Report, September 3, 1973, p.34.

135
Runaways--Teenagers who run away to the hippies. Time, September 15, 1967, p.46.

136
Shayon, R. L. From a hippie's soul: WNEW's "A child again" broadcast. Saturday Review, December 16, 1967, p.46.

137
Surface, B. Case of the runaway teenager. Reader's Digest, May 1970, pp.143-146.

138
Tunley, R. If you're thinking of running away. Seventeen, February 1968, p.138.

139
Whithead, J. Greenwich Village case histories. Look, July 25, 1967, p.26.

140
Youcha, G. Running away, all the way home. Parents Magazine, January 10, 1973, pp.87-91.

*This is not a comprehensive list but rather a representative list of popular magazine articles printed in the late 1960's and early 1970's.

NEWSPAPER ARTICLES*

141
Bachrach, J. Runaway statistics. Washington Post, March 3, 1974, p.H1.

142
Carlson, P. The changing problems of runaways. Boston Phoenix, July 30, 1974, p.5.

143
Claiborne, W.L. Hill panel hears runaways. Washington Post, January 14, 1972, p.C2.

144
A commune thrives in Berlin. New York Times, December 26, 1972, p.38.

145
Et al. Runaways review. New York Times, July 18, 1971, VII, p.10.

146
Janson, D. Philadelphia minister aids runaways. New York Times, July 18, 1971, p.41.

147
Klemesrud, J. Where runaways can find a haven. New York Times, May 1, 1972, p.38.

148
Marchand, Earl, and Corsetti, Paul. The runaways: A lost generation. Boston Herald American and Sunday Herald Advertiser, February 16-22, 1975.

149
Metropolitan briefs: Police unit to seek runaways. New York Times, June 21, 1972, p.47.

150
Phone-a-Home program gives runaways a place to run to. New York Times, November 25, 1972, p.18.

151
Richwine, D. S., & Haynes, W. Always the hope Mikes and Lindas will come home. Boston Globe, May 13, 1974, p.3.

152
Rogers, J. G. Runaway kids: How one city handles the problem. Washington Post, Parade Magazine, October 7, 1973, pp.9-11.

153
Shelters for runaways. New York Times, January 27, 1972, p.18.

154
Smith, O. D. Runaways seek change. Kansas City Star, May 30, 1974, p.4w.

155
Students discuss runaway youths New York Times, May 28, 1972, p.39.

156
Stumbo, B. The runaways. Parts I - V. Los Angeles Times, September 16 - 20, 1973.

*This is not a comprehensive list but rather a representative list of newspaper articles printed since 1971.